NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCCXII.

MARCH, 1891.

# FURTHER RECOLLECTIONS OF GETTYSBURG.

BY

MAJOR-GENERAL DANIEL E. SICKLES,

MAJOR-GENERAL D. MM. GREGG,

MAJOR-GENERAL JOHN NEWTON,

AND

MAJOR-GENERAL DANIEL BUTTERFIELD.

GENERAL SICKLES:

IT WAS indeed an event of rare interest to meet on the battle-field of Gettysburg, on a golden October morning, the best historian of the battle and of the Civil War, our comrade and friend, the Comte de Paris, himself a veteran volunteer of the war; and by his side the son of one of our veterans, a gallant young recruit, the Duc d'Orleans. We miss the knightly Duc de Chartres, another veteran volunteer drawn from the ranks of the royal house of France; but we have with us the Marquis de Lasterie, descendant of Lafayette. Here in the cemetery of dead heroes, under the shadow of the great Reynolds, are assembled in the same group for the first time since the battle all but one of the living corps commanders who fought here, Slocum, Howard, Sickles, Newton, Doubleday; and the leaders of the divisions, Gregg and Wright. We miss Pleasonton, commander of the cavalry corps, kept away by illness, but we have Butterfield, chief of staff. The men who made history surrounded the historian.

The strongest emotion of the visitor to Gettysburg is the memory of those who here nobly fell in battle—"those who here



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gave their lives that the nation might live." Volunteers of 1861–2–3, flower of our young manhood, the loved ones of our Northern homes, volunteers without bounty, men gold could not hire, for whom the flag and the Union were worth all else; men who had only a home to live for and a country to die for. And the great leaders, where are they?—Meade, commander-in-chief; Reynolds, who fell on the first day; Hancock, on the third; Sedgwick, Warren, Buford, Hunt, Kilpatrick. Nor can we forget Hooker, who reorganized the army and led it almost here, his chosen field, compelling Lee to give battle.

The transition from 1863 to 1890, little more than a quarter of a century, almost confounds the imagination, and makes the reality seem like a dream. Now we are more than sixty millions, all freemen, united, prosperous, tranquil. Then we were separated, mangled by the struggles of a great civil war of unforeseen duration, nearly all Europe against us, every resource of men and treasure strained to the utmost tension, no one able to forecast the boundaries which the end of the conflict would define.

The Army of the Potomac has lost the peninsular campaign; it has lost Pope's campaign, and, although it has won Antietam, it has lost Burnside's campaign, and Chancellorsville. The situation at home and abroad is grave. The insurrection that burst upon New York a few days after the battle is already imminent; it is visible in June. England and Napoleon are hostile to the Union, waiting for a suitable pretext to recognize the Southern Confederacy. Public opinion everywhere is much estranged by the Conscription Act of Congress. Resistance is openly threatened. The Proclamation of Emancipation, the organization of colored troops, and kindred measures have alienated large numbers of people. An impression, almost a belief, gains ground that for military, economical, and political reasons the success of the North is doubtful. Such is the general opinion in Europe. It is feared that the enormous cost of the war makes it impossible to prolong the struggle. It is apprehended that, in the absence of volunteers, the losses caused in our armies by desertions, disease, and battles cannot be filled up by bounties or conscriptions; and we have not yet found a commander who inspires at once the government, the people, and the armies with confidence in his ability to lead us to victory.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I would not have seen Gettysburg had Hooker not sent me a message summoning me from New York, where I was slowly recovering from a contusion received at Chancellorsville. He announced the coming battle, asking me to join my command instantly, giving such urgent and flattering reasons that I could not refuse, although my surgeons, Carnochan and Sayres, protested. I reached headquarters at Frederick on the 28th of June, at the hour Hooker was relieved by Meade. Hardie, who was the bearer of the order putting Meade in command, sat by my side from Washington to Frederick, chatting all the way, without revealing a word of his mission. The change in the command of the army was no sooner announced—Hooker sacrificed, on the eve of battle, by the action of Halleck—than I heard from Hayden, and others of my personal friends, earnest remonstrances against my serving under Meade. They knew he was hostile, dating from several incidents in the Chancellorsville campaign. I consult Hooker. He says: "You cannot ask to be relieved on the eve of battle; wait at least until after the engagement." This advice coinciding with my inclinations, I resumed command of the Third Army Corps.

Lee crossed the Potomac on his second invasion of the North at the head of the largest and best-equipped army the South had yet put in the field. It believed itself invincible. It had won many signal victories. It was stronger than ever in numbers, equipment, organization, and discipline. It was led by able corps and division commanders. Lieutenant-General Hood says: "Never before or since have I witnessed such intense enthusiasm as prevailed throughout the entire Confederate army. Exulting cheers reëchoed all along the line. Our forces marched undisturbed to Chambersburg. I found General Lee in the same buoyant spirits which pervaded his magnificent army. After the ordinary salutations he exclaimed: 'Ah, General, the enemy is a long time finding us. If he does not succeed soon, we must go in search of him.'"

Hooker and the Army of the Potomac were not as far off as Lee and his lieutenant supposed. Hooker had no superior in manœuvring a large army. The campaigns of Chancellorsville and Gettysburg are monuments of his strategical skill. Lee's cavalry, under Stuart, were on a long raid and failed to discover Hooker crossing the Potomac at Edwards's Ferry. Pleasonton

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and his cavalry gave us eyes to see Lee's marches and movements, while they blindfolded Lee so that he could not see ours until Hooker was on his rear and flank challenging him to battle.

Lee commands a halt in sight of Harrisburg, on the Susquehanna. What is the matter? His communications are threatened. His retreat may become impossible. He must give or accept battle. He directs the concentration of all his forces at Gettysburg. This was Hooker's revenge for Chancellorsville. Ewell had reconnoitred that position a few days before. It was admirable for the invading army, because it afforded facilities for advance or retreat. And if Lee is quick in his concentration, he may choose a battle-ground as advantageous to him as Fredericksburg. And so it might have been, if bold and sagacious Buford had not stood in the way with a division of cavalry the counterpart of himself.

The battle of Oak Ridge, on July 1, was a surprise to both armies. It, however, gave to Howard the choice of position at Gettysburg, and was worth all it cost, forcing Lee to offensive tactics. General Lee says: "The enemy occupied the point which General Ewell designed to seize. The strong position which the enemy had assumed could not be attacked without danger of exposing the four divisions present, already weakened and exhausted by a long and bloody struggle, to overwhelming numbers of fresh troops." These fresh troops were Birney's division of Sickles's corps and a division of Slocum's corps, the corps commanders both present. Well might General Lee speak of his four divisions as "weakened and exhausted by a long and bloody struggle." The great fight of Robinson's division of the First Corps is an illustration of the terrible conflict at Oak Ridge. Out of 2,500 men on the field, Robinson lost 1,600 in killed and wounded. Hotly engaged for four hours on a July day against overwhelming numbers, repulsing repeated attacks of the enemy, capturing three flags and a very large number of prisoners, they were the last to leave the field. Says Robinson in a letter to Meade, soon after the battle: "We have been proud of our efforts on that day and hope that they will be recognized. It is but natural we should feel disappointed that we are not once referred to in the report of the commanding general."

Lee expected to make his concentration at Gettysburg unopposed. Meade expected to concentrate on his chosen line of Pike

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Creek without interference. Strange, but not impossible, that two mighty armies, eager for combat, in near proximity to each other, like two giants groping in the dark, can march and manœuvre without the presence of one being known to the other.

At Oak Ridge the enemy had four divisions of infantry, Heth's, Pender's, Rodes's, and Early's—seventeen brigades; and sixteen batteries of artillery—the battalions of Pegram, McIntosh, Carter, and Jones. We had the First Corps—seven brigades and five batteries; and the Eleventh Corps—six brigades and five batteries; that is to say, thirteen brigades and ten batteries. The enemy were four brigades stronger in infantry, and they had a few more guns.

General Humphreys—good authority—says Lee had about eighty-five thousand infantry at Gettysburg; that is to say, nine divisions of ninety-five hundred each. In other words, Ewell's four divisions gave him thirty-eight thousand infantry against seventeen thousand five hundred under Reynolds and Howard, with a corresponding superiority over us in artillery.

Reynolds's battle was brought on without orders, perhaps against orders, if Reynolds received, as the other corps commanders received, the circular orders from General Meade issued early in the morning of the 1st of July, which were as follows:

"If the enemy assume the offensive and attack, it is his [General Meade's] intention, after holding them in check long enough to withdraw the trains and other impedimenta, to withdraw the army from its present position and form a line of battle with the left resting in the neighborhood of Middleburg and the right at Manchester, the general direction being at Pipe Creek. . . . For this purpose, General Reynolds, in command of the left wing, will withdraw the force at present at Gettysburg, two corps [First and Eleventh], by the road to Taneytown and Westminster, and, after crossing Pipe Creek, deploy towards Middleburg. The corps at Emmittsburg [Sickles's] will be withdrawn via Mechanicsville to Middleburg."

Reynolds was right in accepting battle as he did, to gain time, as Hancock says, "for the commanding general of the army to come to some decision." Reynolds's battle was necessarily fought, and well fought, by Buford, Doubleday, Robinson, Wadsworth, Fairchild, Huydekoper, and Barlow, and, after Reynolds fell, by Howard in command.

Accident, so potent in war, overruled the plans of Meade, drifting him towards a position chosen by the enemy; a better battlefield than he had himself chosen, it had for us the ad-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vantages of strong defensive lines and excellent communications, and the enemy was there—sure. Slocum, Hancock, Howard, Sickles, and Doubleday urged Meade that night to come to Gettysburg with all his army. He came. And so swift was the concentration of his forces, under the direction of the chief of staff, that on the morning of the 2d of July his army was in position, except the Sixth Corps, which had a long march from Westminster, thirty miles, and could not reach the field until late in the afternoon.

As these reminiscences are personal, I will dwell a moment on an anxious hour spent at Emmittsburg in the afternoon of the 1st of July, after hearing of the death of Reynolds, and receiving from Howard and Doubleday earnest appeals for support at Gettysburg. My orders from the general commanding were to hold Emmittsburg at all hazards. These orders, of course, were based on the supposition that the enemy's point of concentration would be at or near Emmittsburg, but no enemy was near. Reconnoissances and scouts for miles around gave no indication of the presence or proximity of a hostile force. The situation of Howard, so pressed by superior numbers, was hard to resist. Why stay here in idle security, in formal obedience to orders? What order would Meade give if he were here in person and read Howard's despatch? He would say: "Yes; march to Gettysburg." And so say I: "Yes; I will go, and take the risk of approval. It must be said, at least, that the Third Corps marches in the right direction,—toward the enemy." At 3:15 P. M. I wrote to Howard: "The Third Corps will march to Gettysburg immediately." The column is formed; two brigades under Graham and De Trobriand, with two batteries, are left to hold Emmittsburg. We move forward cheerfully, over a rough road, on a sultry afternoon. We arrive at Gettysburg, marching along the enemy's flank, uninterrupted. The welcome of Howard and his men rewarded us. We saw the proofs of their bloody fight, their resolute bearing, awaiting another attack, intrenched in their strong position on Cemetery Ridge. The Third Corps was massed on their left. At 9:30 that night I wrote to General Meade urging the concentration of his forces at Gettysburg, expressing the opinion that "it is a good battlefield for us, although weak on the left flank." Later in the night I received from General Meade an expression of his approval of my march from Emmittsburg against orders, and also instruc-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tions to bring up the two brigades and batteries I had left at Emmittsburg under Graham and De Trobriand.

The early morning of July 2 was spent reconnoitring my front on the left, choosing positions, gathering information about the roads, and learning something of the force and dispositions of the enemy. The prolongation of the line of Cemetery Ridge, perhaps the more desirable tactical position for me to occupy, unless overruled by superior considerations, proved upon examination to be an unsatisfactory line because of its marked depression and the swampy character of the ground between Cemetery Ridge and Little Round Top. The most commanding position on the field was Little Round Top and the ridge running from it toward the Emmittsburg road. Moreover, to abandon the Emmittsburg road to the enemy would be unpardonable. The force at my disposition, ten thousand men, was insufficient to hold the lines from Cemetery Ridge to Round Top and defend that height, which was obviously the key to our position. Longstreet had thirteen brigades of infantry. I had six brigades. He had sixty guns. I had thirty. Information from scouts and from Buford's cavalry on my flank indicated the presence of considerable bodies of the enemy's forces on my front, concealed in the woods and manœuvring to envelop our left. The ground was rocky and undulated with ridges ; convenient roads through woods and valleys gave the enemy excellent opportunities for turning our left flank and gaining our rear.

I had pointed out, the night before, in a letter to General Meade, that our left was our assailable point. Careful study of the field during the morning had confirmed my impressions. At 11 o'clock the reconnoissances of General Berdan with his sharpshooters and Colonel Lake with the 4th Maine revealed the formation of the enemy's columns in large masses, preparing to attack. General Tremain and Colonel Moore, my aides-de-camp, rode over to headquarters again and again all through the morning, reporting the situation of things on my front. Impatient of longer delay, more than ever anxious in view of the certainty of an attack from superior numbers, staggered by the announcement that Buford's division of cavalry had been withdrawn from my flank and ordered to escort trains to Westminster, thirty miles away, I went in person to headquarters and asked General Meade to come with me and reconnoitre the left. He was too busy. I

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

asked for General Warren; Warren was busy on the right preparing for an attack by the right wing on Culp's Hill, under Slocum. Butterfield was too busy preparing Meade's orders. Hunt, chief of artillery, was seated near by. I earnestly asked for Hunt, because I needed his advice in placing my own batteries, and others from the reserve which I was sure to require. Hunt was allowed to go with me.

We went over my part of the field together, looked at all the ground, from the swale and swamp between Cemetery Ridge and Round Top, to my proposed line running from Round Top along the ridge to the Emmittsburg road, *en échelon* to Cemetery Ridge and the line of Hancock's corps. Hunt liked my chosen line, pointing out, however, that more troops than I had would be necessary to hold it. Hunt and Randolph, my chief of artillery, found excellent positions for my batteries; all was in readiness for my advance except orders from headquarters. Hunt assured me I might look for orders as soon as he made his report to General Meade, declining himself to take any responsibility, because he was ignorant of the plans of the general commanding, and so much depended upon his determination to stand on the defensive, or to attack, or to manœuvre for another position. I waited an hour. No orders came. My troops, eager for combat and anxious to profit by all the advantages of the ground, levelled all the fences within their reach. The movements of the enemy became more and more aggressive. Their assault seemed to have been delayed by a change in the route of their columns, caused, as appears from their official reports, by my discovery of their formation and the advantages they found in enveloping our left by a march though the forest, which had been uncovered by the unfortunate withdrawal of Buford's cavalry from the flank.

Impossible to wait longer without giving the enemy serious advantages in his attack, I advanced my line towards the highest ground in my front, occupying the Emmittsburg road at the very point were Longstreet hoped to cross it unopposed, covering Round Top and menacing the enemy's flank if he attempted to turn our left. He accepted battle on my line. Birney's division extended from the Devil's Den, a great mass of boulder rocks, across the wheat fields and Peach Orchard, towards the Emmittsburg road. Humphreys's division held my right and the Emmittsburg road. It was 3 o'clock. The enemy's lines of battle were developing in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

enormous strength. The artillery opened fire. I am summoned to headquarters. What can it mean ?

(Circular.)

HEADQUARTERS ARMY OF THE POTOMAC,
July 2, '63, 3 P. M.

The commanding general desires to see you at headquarters. Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

DANIEL BUTTERFIELD,
Major-General and Chief of Staff.

Sent to Major-Generals Sedgwick, Sickles, Sykes, Newton, Slocum, Howard, and Hancock.

General Sykes says : "At 3 P. M. General Meade sent for me, and while myself and other commanders were conversing with him the enemy formally opened the battle, and developed his attack on our left. I was at once ordered to throw my whole corps to that point, and hold it all hazards."

It is evident the commanding general has no just appreciation of the gravity of matters on my front. Else why summon me and all the corps commanders to headquarters at such a critical moment? This question is answered by General Meade's telegram to Halleck, general-in-chief, at the same hour, 3 P. M. July 2 :

"The army is fatigued . . . If not attacked, and I can get any positive information of the position of the enemy which will justify me in so doing, I shall attack. If I find it hazardous to do so, or am satisfied the enemy is endeavoring to move to my rear and interpose between me and Washington, I shall fall back to my supplies at Westminster. . . . I feel fully the responsibility resting upon me, but will endeavor to act with caution."

This telegram from our commanding-general shows that at the supreme moment—3 P. M. July 2—when the enemy was advancing to attack, we had no plan of action, no order of battle. For Meade the battle of July 2 is a surprise, like the battle of July 1. Lee knows what he wants to do ; his corps commanders know his plans ; they know the order of battle ; they are executing it.

Unable to reply in writing, I point out to the staff officer who brought the order the attitude and movements of the enemy, and ask him to beg General Meade to excuse me from complying with the order, as my presence is necessary with my command. A second order comes from headquarters, peremptory, immediate. I reluctantly turn over the command to Birney, and proceed to headquarters. General Meade meets me at his door, saying : "You need not dismount, General. I hear the sound of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cannon on your front. Return to your command. I will join you there at once."

The sound of my guns breaks up the council. We fight here.

Spurring my horse to the utmost speed, I soon relieve Birney. The battle begins with the quickening fire of the skirmishers. General Meade arrives; thinks my line too much extended; too weak to resist the enemy. "Yes," I reply; "but I can hold him until reënforcements arrive. I will contract my line, or modify it, if you prefer. My men are easily manœuvred under fire." "No," said Meade, "it is too late; I will support you. I will order up the Fifth Corps on your left; call upon Hancock to support your centre and right. If you need more artillery send to the reserve for it."

Leaving me with these instructions, I did not see General Meade again, nor receive any communication from him, during the action. The enemy's attack was pressed with all the vigor and boldness characteristic of Longstreet, Lee's ablest lieutenant. The conception of the enemy's movement was based upon Jackson's assault on our right flank at Chancellorsville. The force employed was about the same. The ground, woods, and roads all favored it; and the loss of Buford's cavalry made it practicable. But the menacing attitude of my corps, in close proximity to Longstreet's column, threatening its flank, compelled every inch of ground to be disputed from the outset. Every inch of ground was disputed along the whole line, from Round Top to the Peach Orchard. Warren, who comes with Meade, goes to Round Top to reconnoitre. Seeing the efforts of the enemy to envelop my left, quickly discerning the importance of Round Top and the enemy's desire to seize it, Warren sends to me for a brigade. I have none to spare, needing every man, and more, on my front. I advise him to send to the Fifth Corps, already on the march toward us. Another message from Warren, saying the heads of column of the Fifth Corps are still distant and may arrive too late. We have seen it was not ordered over from the right until after 3 o'clock. At this moment the gallant and gifted Weed, of Ayres's division, reports in person to me that his brigade is near.

Pressed by Birney for support on my left, pressed by Warren for troops to occupy Round Top, the key of our position, I send Weed to him just in time. The gallant Weed falls mortally wounded on Round Top, and Hazlett, too, was killed as he leaned

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

over the body of the dying Weed to hear his last words. Zook's, Cross's, and Brooke's brigades, of Caldwell's division, of Hancock's corps, arrive and are at once engaged. The full force of the enemy's attack is felt. Zook and Cross and O'Rorke are mortally wounded. Our lines waver, but rally again and again. The same ground is fought over and over. Barksdale, of Mississippi, is mortally wounded in a charge within our lines. The chivalrous Graham, on my centre, falls seriously wounded and is captured by the enemy. The brave Ellis, leading his Orange Blossoms, is killed in the Devil's Den while leading a charge of the 124th New York. Vincent and Willard are killed at the head of their brigades. Bigelow's battery, in front of my corps colors, loses more than half its men and eighty horses. Randolph and Seely are wounded. The Sixth Corps is coming, our strongest corps, and is ordered to support the left. Humphreys, Carr, Brewster, and Sewell, of my corps, are engaged. Gallant Crawford, of the Fifth Corps, with a regimental flag in his hand, leads his Pennsylvania Reserves in a charge on the enemy's flank and front and drives him out of reach. This is the same division so brilliantly led by General Meade at Fredericksburg. Humphreys still stands firm on the right. I am wounded. I turn over my command to Birney and am carried to the rear, knowing that victory is ours.

We see from this glance at the battle of July 2 that as soon as our troops on the left equalled those of the enemy the battle was decided in our favor. If this equality had existed at the outset of the conflict, our victory would have been decisive early in the action, and the Sixth Corps, our strongest, would have been available to follow up our success and deal a decisive blow to the enemy; and if Buford's division of cavalry had remained on the left flank, its coöperation would have given us overwhelming advantages. With two corps, say twenty-five thousand men, holding the left, intrenched in good positions, holding Round Top and commanding the ridges and roads on our left, the repulse of the enemy would have been as disastrous to them as our assault on their lines at Fredericksburg was destructive to us. With the Fifth Corps in reserve on the left, our fight would have been an easier one, but Sykes was not engaged until 5 o'clock.

A signal feature of this battle was the buoyancy of the troops, their readiness to respond to commands, the eagerness of chiefs of battalions, batteries, and brigades to support each other, often

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

without formal orders. The charges and countercharges between sunset and dusk would take pages to describe. The impetuosity of the men and their field leaders in the Second, Third, and Fifth Corps was a priceless factor, without which our victory would not have been achieved. And it is remarkable, as showing the fierceness of the struggle on the 2d of July, that the losses of the enemy in both Hood's and McLaws's divisions exceeded the losses in killed and wounded in Pickett's division on the following day. The losses on both sides on the second day were greater in killed and wounded than the combined losses suffered on the first and third days of the battle. It is a moderate and safe estimate of the enemy's forces engaged on the second day to place them at thirty thousand infantry and eighty pieces of artillery. Hood's, McLaws's and Anderson's divisions included thirteen brigades of at least twenty-five hundred men each. The artillery of Longstreet's and Hill's corps amounted to one hundred and forty-four guns.

At the close of the battle of the 2d, after the enemy retired, the disposition of our forces remained as already described, except that a portion of the First Corps was moved to the left of Cemetery Ridge, the Third Corps under Birney, in support; Carr's brigade, of the Third Corps, slept on the field, in its position on my right. On the other flank, at Culp's Hill, the enemy had gained a foothold in our works during the absence of a considerable part of the Twelfth Corps, under Williams, which was ordered to our left, but Greene's brigade fought like a division and held the enemy, until Slocum, commanding our right wing, brought back his forces and drove Ewell once more to his position.

We pass over the council of war on the night of the 2d without comment, since it had no result. We stayed and fought it out at Gettysburg. General Lee persisted in his offensive tactics, against the remonstrance of Longstreet, and notwithstanding that our left had been made so strong as to resist the assaults of thirty thousand men the day before, General Lee rashly attempted to break our lines with eighteen thousand men on the 3d. It is true he expected the coöperation of Stuart's cavalry on our rear, but our cavalry, Gregg on our right and Kilpatrick on our left, had destroyed that hope, inflicting decisive defeats on Stuart, whose object Pleasonton, Gregg, and Kilpatrick quickly divined.

The great cavalry combat of Gregg we hear described by him-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

self in modest, yet vivid, colors. Scarcely mentioned in the official reports, yet we see it was one of the most brilliant incidents of the Gettysburg campaign. Twelve thousand sabres flashing in the July sun on the open fields beyond our right. The thunder of two hundred cannon echoing from the main army answered Gregg's and Stuart's artillery. The ripening grain withered under the tread of heavy columns—columns of squadrons charging again and again, whilst the reapers of Gregg and Custer gathered a harvest of honor and fame.

Kilpatrick, too, with his division of cavalry, supported our left, besides the Fifth and Sixth Corps and a portion of the First, with the Third in reserve. Kilpatrick's cavalry battle on the 3d was no less effective on our left, as from this flank also the enemy's cavalry attempted to gain our rear and unite with Longstreet in piercing our left centre. In this fight the gallant Farnsworth fell. "A general on the 29th, on the 30th he baptized his star in blood, and on July 3d, for the honor of his young brigade and the glory of his corps, he gave his life. At the head of his dragoons, at the very muzzles of the enemy's guns, he fell with many mortal wounds." So writes Kilpatrick.

The story of the third day has been so often told in all its dramatic details that it has become a familiar picture of the battle of Gettysburg. It need not be repeated here. We had won the battle. Longstreet pronounced the enemy's last assault hopeless from the beginning. No troops, he said, however valiant, whatever their discipline, could make any serious impression on our left or left centre, the direction of the attack. So profoundly was he impressed with the forlorn and desperate character of the assault that he was unable, he says, to give utterance to the order to Pickett. In reply to Pickett's demand whether he should move, Longstreet could only nod his head in the affirmative. The assault ended, as Longstreet had foreseen, in the annihilation of the advancing columns of the enemy; a useless sacrifice of brave men, sometimes necessary in war, but not required on that day to vindicate the courage and discipline or fortitude of Lee's great army.

The headquarters staff was marked by signal ability. Butterfield had been already distinguished as a commander in the field. In the movement of large columns he had no superior in our armies. Hunt, our chief of artillery, would have won distinction

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

under Napoleon. He was ably supported by Tyler, commanding the reserve artillery. Warren, chief of engineers, was accomplished both in his special corps and as a commander. Pleasonton, chief of the cavalry corps, made his arm superior to that of the enemy in every equal combat. Besides, he was gifted with rare military intuitions. He sent Buford, with our strongest cavalry division, to Gettysburg, when nobody had divined the place chosen by Lee to concentrate his army for battle. He sent Gregg to our right to encounter Stuart and thwart his movement to our rear; on the third day, the day of Pickett's assault, he sent Kilpatrick on our left, where the enemy attempted a similar diversion, but was defeated.

Our army corps were ably commanded. Sedgwick, Reynolds, Slocum, Hancock, Howard, Newton, Doubleday, and Birney were all strong men, each differing from the others in elements of strength, yet forming a group of remarkable power. General Slocum and General Howard were chosen afterwards by General Sherman to command the right and left wings, respectively, of his great army in its famous campaign through Georgia. In the campaign of Gettysburg we lost three corps commanders—Reynolds, killed on the 1st of July; Sickles, wounded on the 2d; and Hancock on the 3d.

As Lincoln said to me, "There was glory enough at Gettysburg to go all round, from Meade to the humblest enlisted man in the ranks."

Military men are fond of comparisons between Waterloo and Gettysburg. There are, indeed, several military resemblances, but more contrasts; whilst in moral and political significance these two great battles are as wide apart as the fields themselves. Waterloo put an end to the rule of Napoleon and the military supremacy of France in Europe, already impaired by the campaign in Russia. Gettysburg upheld the authority of the wise and unselfish Lincoln, and assured the perpetuity of the American Union. Waterloo was the triumph of the reigning monarchs of Europe over the French Revolution. Gettysburg prevented an alliance between the Southern Confederacy and England and France to divide and destroy the United States. Waterloo restored France to the Bourbons. Gettysburg severed the chains from every slave in America, giving force and effect to Lincoln's Proclamation of Emancipation, which before was only an edict.

And here at Gettysburg I hope that the War Department will

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

establish a permanent military post, garrisoned by artillery, and that on this consecrated ground, all of which should belong to the government, the morning and evening gun may forever salute "the men who here gave their lives that the nation might live."

DANIEL E. SICKLES,
Major-General U. S. Army (retired).

---

GENERAL GREGG:

WHEN those two giants of the War of the Rebellion, the Armies of the Potomac and of Northern Virginia, had determined, by invitation of the latter, to seek a new field of combat far removed from the desolated plains of Virginia, that of Gettysburg was well chosen. Its commanding eminences, with the undulating vale between, all under cultivation, with here and there open groves of goodly trees, gave to the infantry and artillery of the combatants all that could be desired for effective attack and defence. Off on the flanks were fair and wide fields for mounted cavalry by thousands to mingle in wild mêlée, where pistol and sabre did their keenest work, and light batteries scattered canister most grievously in the faces of their would-be captors.

A field which made it possible for a great battle to be fought to the finish, in which each of the three arms of service was properly employed in its own sphere, and thus rendered its most effective service. There were attacks sublime in execution even to the point of their failure, which only occurred because success was impossible. Resistance was heroic. Surprises there were none, but there were many mighty rushes.

On one of the bright days of October last, on this famous field were assembled some eight generals and a smaller number of officers of lesser rank, all having served in the Union army in the battle of Gettysburg. Of the general officers, five had been corps commanders, one the chief of staff, and the remaining two division commanders of infantry and cavalry respectively. They were in attendance upon the distinguished historian of the War of the Rebellion, the Count of Paris, with whom all had served on the peninsular campaign.

The same sky was above. Round Top, Culp's Hill, and Brinkerhoff Ridge, the village with the seminary and cemetery, were all there. The stage was the same, but where were the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

actors? where the great masses of men that were clad in blue and in gray? Could there be a reassembling of the mighty armies that contested this field twenty-seven years ago, those that could appear in the flesh would be outnumbered by the ghostly representatives of the dead. Nor have these assembled officers escaped the change that time works. When the battle was fought, the oldest of them had not more than reached the full maturity of manhood; and now the youngest could only claim to be in the old age of youth or the youth of old age.

It was a pleasant meeting. There were a kindness of greeting and heartiness of grasp that plainly showed how glad these old soldiers were to meet again, some not having met since the close of the war. As each stood upon the portion of the field where his command engaged the enemy, his story was briefly told. Indeed, it was scarcely more than pointing out lines and positions. The historian was not here so much to learn as to verify. A question asked, he was quick to be the narrator.

The entire field having been gone over, the party separated, all feeling that the day had been pleasantly and profitably spent. The old battlefield has dotted over it along the entire Union line monuments both beautiful and chaste, but the work of adornment is incomplete. On some commanding point near the centre of the line there should rise a colossal monument to the memory of the commander of the Army of the Potomac, George Gordon Meade. It should be built of material as pure as his character and as enduring as his fame.

In front of it, and just beyond the reach of its tallest shadow, there should be another to his able lieutenant, Winfield Scott Hancock, who on this and a score of other fields showed that his first commander had not erred in styling him "superb."

D. MM. GREGG.

---

GENERAL NEWTON:

THE recent visit to the field of Gettysburg in company with the Comte de Paris, the Duc d'Orleans, and the gentlemen who accompanied them to this country, was an interesting event, whether regarded in the light of bringing the distinguished historian of our Civil War face to face with the military features of that great battlefield, or of affording a few of the survivors of the battle, who escorted the party, the opportunity of renewing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their memories of the deadly and gigantic struggle, which was a turning-point in the fortunes of the Union and of the Confederacy.

Thanks to the liberality of the governments, national and State, the individual share which each organization, on the Union side at least, took in the battle is recorded in words and in many cases in stone monuments, and adequate information has also been collected in regard to the Confederate forces; so that all that is required, beyond what has been done and is now in progress, is the historian who is capable, from the immense magazine of facts placed at his disposal, to group these scientifically in the relation of cause to effect, and to correct history, may be, by assigning anew to the prominent leaders on either side their just measure of praise or censure.

I do not think it possible to have gone the rounds of that field, listening to the simple, and in the main accurate, acounts of the incidents of the contest from the lips of the guides, without being profoundly moved.

Beginning with the action of the first day, we see the First and the Eleventh Corps displayed in an arc of a circle, covering the roads from Chambersburg and York, respectively, to Gettysburg. The Third Confederate Corps, Lieutenant-General A. P. Hill, from Chambersburg attack the First Corps on the Seminary Ridge, and the Second Confederate Corps, Lieutenant-General R. S. Ewell, from York attack the position of the Eleventh Corps. The contest, with unequal numbers against the First Corps, wages fiercely for hours, until after the lines of the Eleventh Corps were forced by the enemy. This exposed the line of retreat of the First Corps, and numbers were captured subsequently in the attempt to fall back through Gettysburg to the Cemetery Ridge. In this affair that splendid soldier General Reynolds, commanding the Union troops, fell early in the day.

The fault, if any, of the First Corps was in the obstinacy of their resistance, and in bravely prolonging the fight after their right flank and rear had become exposed. Who is responsible for the failure to give the order to fall back in season, it is not proposed to discuss in this article.

The position of the Eleventh Corps was, in a military sense, a nearly smooth plain, which afforded the opportunity for a magnificent display of artillery. A competent force of guns here would



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have checked Ewell, or at least have seriously delayed him, and the disaster to the First Corps from having its flank and rear turned would have been prevented.

Another inquiry pertinent to the occasion is why the Union forces, which operated on interior lines with respect to the enemy, should in this first important action have appeared on the field with inferior forces. This in itself was a great blunder.

The remnants of the First Corps and the Eleventh Corps took position on the Cemetery Ridge, where they were early reënforced by the Twelfth Corps, which occupied Culp's Hill and formed the extreme right of the Army of the Potomac during this and the subsequent days.

General Lee, after having a reconnoissance made of the new position of the Union forces on Cemetery Ridge, declined a further attack that day, although with the superior Confederate force upon the field the chances of success under the circumstances, by a flank movement to the right, would have been good. As a result of the battle of the first day (July 1), the First Corps was reduced to about 3,300 men, and one of the divisions of the corps to 900 men. On the second day a new Vermont brigade was assigned to the Third Division, making the total of the corps between 6,000 and 7,000 men. The Eleventh Corps suffered, but not so severely.

Just here, to prevent misconception, it is necessary to state that the term "corps" as applied to organizations in the Union army was often a misnomer, as some of the corps might in respect to numbers be properly called divisions. The Confederate corps deserved the name.

Until some statistician devotes himself to an elaborate analysis of the battle returns of the Union and Confederate armies, it is impossible in most cases to ascertain the relative strength of either in their engagements; for while the Confederates counted the men in line of battle, the Union authorities stupidly relied upon the muster returns for the strength of their armies. Consequently it was seldom possible to ascertain, even approximately, the actual number present in battle. There were other causes of a selfish nature which sometimes swelled on paper the number in regiments.

On the night of the 1st of July Ewell's corps was in Gettysburg, with the left threatening Culp's Hill; Hill's corps occupied

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Seminary Ridge. Two divisions of Longstreet's were four miles from Gettysburg; the other division, Pickett's, was absent and not available for service on the second day.

On the Union side the Twelfth Corps occupied the extreme right at Culp's Hill; next came Wadsworth's division of the First Corps; then the Eleventh Corps on Cemetery Ridge; on their left Robinson's division of the First Corps. The portion of the Third Corps that had come up occupied the extreme left of Meade's forces present on the field.

A long space from the left of the Third Corps to and including the Round Top was entirely unguarded, and this fact, as well as the easy nature of the ground, invited an attack here from the enemy.

The testimony is direct and not to be questioned that Longstreet was ordered by General Lee to attack early in the morning of July 2 with two divisions of his corps, supported by Anderson's division of Hill's corps, and turn the Union left before reënforcements, which were the Second, Fifth, and Sixth Corps and a portion of the Third, should arrive. As soon as Longstreet's guns opened, Ewell was to assail our right and Hill to lend such assistance to both as the case might demand.

A vigorous and concerted attack of this nature could scarcely, in the absence of more than half of the Army of the Potomac, have failed of success by cutting that army in two, and thus have caused a disaster which it is unpleasant even now to contemplate. At all events, even if interrupted in complete success by the arrival of the Second Corps, which took place about 7 A.M., still the Confederates could have seized the Round Top, which alone would have rendered the position of the Union army untenable.

Longstreet did not attack, and his reasons for abstaining have never seen the light.

On the other hand, the serious nature of the mistake that was made in permitting a dispersion of the Union forces at the critical moment of the campaign is thus brought home to the mind of every one.

After the arrival of the Second Corps, which took up the position occupied by the Third Corps, the latter advanced to the front beyond the general line, and occupied the place which has become historic as the Peach Orchard. This spot, the Devil's Den, the rocky slopes leading to the summit, and the Round Top

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

itself, became on that eventful afternoon the theatre of a bloody and memorable contest between the Third Corps and portions of the other corps on one side and Longstreet's forces on the other. Longstreet did not attack until 4 P.M., and up to that moment, and even for some time beyond it, he might have seized the Round Top, for the attention of the Union commander does not appear to have been called to its importance until a late hour of the day.

Notwithstanding the bloody results of the day to the Union forces, who fought under the peculiar disadvantage of having to meet the initiative of the enemy without a well-defined plan of their own, the end was, on the whole, favorable, as, after two days of apparent reverses, they found themselves *hammered* into a good position.

I had the opportunity to express this idea in the way of congratulation to General Meade at nightfall of the 2d of July, when the battle of the day was over.

The intrenched lines of the Twelfth Corps on the right were on this afternoon considerably stripped of troops, and Johnson's division of Ewell's corps took advantage of this fact to occupy a portion. To anticipate events a little, on the morning of the 3d of July, at a very early hour, Johnson was attacked, and after a fierce struggle was forced to leave, and the Twelfth Corps resumed full possession of its first position.

The visit paid to the little old building which was General Meade's headquarters during the battle revived recollections of the council of war held on the night of the 2d of July, which has been so variously represented that a simple statement of its proceedings is in order here. After calling from each corps commander for a field return of the number of his troops, the discussion turned on the probabilities of the morrow. All agreed, so far as I remember, that the position in itself was a good one, but I suggested the possibility of an attempt to turn our left, which could be done with a whole corps secretly at night and without breaking or weakening too much the Confederate lines; that we ought to look to it by having a force there to prevent such a demonstration. General Meade said that Lee would attack the next day on the easy ground between the Cemetery and Round Top. I replied that I thought General Lee too good a soldier to do that, as he would infallibly be badly whipped. We were both

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

correct, it seems; General Lee did attack, and at the same time he was badly whipped. For the rest, the council unanimously voted to fight it out on the position we held. A force also was sent to watch for any attempt to turn the left flank.

Early on the morning of the 3d of July, about daybreak, a terrific fire of musketry at the position of the Twelfth Corps gave notice that the contest with Johnson's Confederate division had begun.

The Third Division of the First had the evening before taken post on the left of the Second Corps, and on the morning of the 3d I found that our line thence to the Round Top was very incomplete. Reporting the fact to General Meade, I was directed to get troops from the Sixth Corps, and batteries from the reserve artillery to fill out the empty spaces. By my official report it was about noon before this was completed. Longstreet meanwhile had been ordered to attack early; he had at his disposal Pickett's, Hood's, and McLaws's divisions of his corps, and R. H. Anderson's division of Hill's corps, and, later, Heth's and Pender's division of the same corps; this attack was to be supported with artillery.

The attack was not made early or with all the force that was available; neither was it supported by the artillery, because that arm had beforehand exhausted, it is said, its ammunition. This defect was not made known to General Lee before the attack was made.

It is a matter of speculation what would have been the result if the attack had been made in full force, supported by artillery, early in the day, before our lines on the left to the Round Top had been consolidated.

It has been the occasion of unfavorable criticism of General Meade that, on the repulse of the final charge, he did not take aggressive action. I think, however, a candid consideration of all the circumstances will show that little benefit could have followed such a movement.

The same might be said of an attempt to press the Confederates in their retreat to the Potomac. In the broken and wooded country traversed by them numberless positions for defence offered themselves, and the assailants would have suffered out of all proportion to the defenders. Finally, the proposed attack on the Confederate lines at Williamsport was pronounced folly by the most experienced officers of the Army of the Potomac.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I have not attempted criticism, except of the scattered condition of our army on the first and second days, but I give facts sufficient to attract the attention of historians and thereby to lead to a full investigation and thorough analysis of this battle.

JOHN NEWTON,
Commanding First Corps, 2d and 3d July, 1863.

---

GENERAL BUTTERFIELD:

THE successful reunion of the surviving corps commanders at Gettysburg to meet the Comte de Paris—save only the thorough soldier Gibbon, of the Second Corps, stationed so far away on the Pacific as to cause no effort for his presence through the uncertainty of our date, and the able cavalry commander Pleasonton, an invalid and unable to respond to the call—left nothing other than their absence to regret.

Time was cut short from the Gettysburg programme by the most interesting tour of the previous day, which covered the battle-grounds of Harper's Ferry, Bolivar Heights, and Antietam, with a charming trip to the Mountain House. None of us will forget the vivid picture of the battle of Antietam so clearly drawn and pointed out from the Confederate side by Colonel Kyd Douglas. The mountain view repaid us for the loss of the two hours of that afternoon intended for Gregg's cavalry fight. But we were fortunate enough to get that next day.

The well-known and competent guide, Long, who has a correct knowledge of all roads, lines, and positions of organizations of both armies in the battle, was placed with the driver of the first carriage to show the route selected. This carriage contained always the Comte de Paris, the Duc d'Orleans, his son, and the corps commander of the particular line or position where we were, changing as required. An order of the day had been prepared, and, by the courtesy of the railway staff of General Orland Smith, copied and distributed. Each commander was thus prepared in advance for the journey over his lines. Colonel de Parseval, the Duc d'Uzes, and Captain Treat rode near the leading carriage, and thus we were well organized for the tour of the battlefield.

The programme was as thoroughly adhered to and complied with by all present, through the force of soldierly habit, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

evident necessity for our purpose, and the character of the assemblage, as if a military order from a supreme commander. Recognition of this feature is a double satisfaction in that it is a pleasure and a duty.

All went smoothly. Surprises were not looked for, but they came—of exceeding interest to most of us; to none more than the writer.

Howard's and Doubleday's descriptions of the first day's battle and the movements of glorious Buford's cavalry and the First and Eleventh Corps gave a clearer understanding of the extent of the lines, the work done, the ability shown on that day, with the unfavorable conditions existing on our side, which were never so clearly understood and appreciated before by many of those present.

The guide's face showed profound astonishment when the Count pointed out, before they were indicated to him, positions and localities he had never seen. For the first time on the field, previous study of the battle and the War Department maps had made him as familiar with it as if he had fought the battle.

In the first half-hour the Count ventured to correct an accidental error as to a locality indicated by one of our number; and the Count was right. It was simply marvellous to us all, this faculty and knowledge of our gallant comrade and historian.

The current of affairs going smoothly gave moments for thought and recall of incidents, between the clear and cold analytical statements (if one might use the expression) of the corps commanders as to their lines, positions, and movements, and those of the enemy. The guide furnished occasionally, when requested,—with more poetic license of description than a military report ordinarily carries,—a glowing word-picture of the battle's phases, replete with details as to the location of troops and commands engaged on both sides. By this we first knew what was told to the world of visitors to the field. It was a surprise again to find so much accuracy in the recital as to position and commands. Many things were not told. How could they be? They were not known.

Overlooking the field, and hearing a side discussion as to the opening of the battle, recalled the incident of General Hooker's words in laying down a map of Pennsylvania and Maryland early in June. By the light of subsequent events it seemed a marvellous inspiration or intuition.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"They are worrying at Washington and throughout the North," said he, "fearing we shall permit Lee's army to get across the Potomac. If he would not cross otherwise, I would lay the bridges for him and give him a safe pass across the river. But he will cross, and we must endeavor to guide his march *there.*"

Suiting the action to his words, he pointed on the map to the Williamsport crossing, and, running his finger along the west side of South Mountain Range, stopped at the point where the shading indicated a break or pass, saying:

"He will go on this route, and we will fight the battle *here*, and, before we fight it, concentrate troops enough from all available sources to prevent Lee's return. If he gets away with his army, the country can have my head for a football, and will be entitled to it."

The battle point indicated was Gettysburg!

Subsequently to this conversation an order to proceed to Washington and Baltimore, securing 15,000 troops from Heintzelman's command at the capital and Schenck's in Maryland, and place them near the passes of the South Mountain, failed through General Halleck's declaration to President Lincoln, in my presence, that such withdrawal would endanger Washington. Schenck freely offered what could be assembled and spared from his command. The result was a Maryland brigade only. The 7th New York (city) National Guard was offered, and many of them were anxious to go. But it was decided to leave them in Baltimore.

The refusal by Halleck of this column strengthened Hooker's feeling that there was a want of proper support at headquarters, and culminated with the Harper's Ferry incident of the like refusal of French's 10,000 and Hooker's request to be relieved. He said there was too much at stake to permit any personal feeling, and he felt it his duty to ask to be relieved, and the command given to some one who would receive all support.

In a private conversation with President Lincoln at the camp at headquarters, after Chancellorsville, Hooker had indicated to the President his unbounded confidence in Reynolds and Meade as capable commanders for that or any army.

But three days in advance of the impending and intended battle, one of the most self-contained, conservative, quiet, and at the same time gallant, soldiers of the Army of the Potomac

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was called out of bed before daylight—an utter surprise to himself—and placed in command of the army. So quiet and unobtrusive were the ways of General Meade that he was in some parts of the army almost personally unknown. All knew of his gallant fight at Fredericksburg. He thought to assemble the army at Frederick, and have a review, to see and know and be known by those portions of the army with which he was not familiar. Upon receiving an explanation of the entire situation, he assented to the continued march of our columns prepared for the next day, and the programme of Hooker's movement after French's column was refused him was carried out unchanged until Reynolds reached Gettysburg and met the enemy. Hooker was to send French, under the command of Slocum, with the Twelfth Corps upon Lee's line of communications. This was abandoned when French's troops were denied him.

But we are not to fight the battle over again in this article. It would take more than a number of THE REVIEW to place in the record much that would be of interest. More will be interested, perhaps, in impressions and reminiscences. So many years after, men then unborn are now living and important factors in the body politic. It would seem hardly possible that they could realize what Gettysburg meant without the personal experience of the time.

The absolute self-possession and quiet demeanor of the corps commanders present at this (in war history) unique assemblage so many years after the battle, though marked, was not as strongly marked as the same characteristic of all during the three days' fighting. It strongly and forcibly recalled it.

Typical of this, it brought back Meade sitting quietly on the little grass plot at the roadside of the headquarters house, in the midst of the battle; shells bursting constantly every few minutes and officers' horses disabled; surrounded by a small group of staff officers attached to headquarters; telling, as quietly as if at a quiet home in a peaceful glen, an interesting experience and incident of his career as a young officer. Generals Sharpe, the loved Seth Williams, Perkins, and others were of the group. The world might naturally suppose that, with the immense responsibility so suddenly placed upon him unsought and unexpected, Meade might have been a trifle nervous or excited. If he was, he never betrayed it. This self-possession and absolute coolness, so

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

marked throughout that battle on the part not only of the principal commanders, but of most of the subordinates, was more strong and pronounced, to so express it, than in any of a score of battles of personal recollection and experience.

Slocum was much more quiet and collected on the night of the council of war (after the second day's battle), when, reclining with almost absolute nonchalance, he answered, as his vote on the proposition of a change of our position, "*Stay and fight it out*," than he was when listening to the words of Howard, Doubleday, Gregg, and the others so many years after. He did not tell us why the proposal to which he had assented, and for which he held his command ready, to follow up the repulse of Pickett's assault, was not accepted or approved.

We never thought to ask him of the truth of the story current of the oldest living and one of the bravest of Gettysburg's veterans, General Greene, beloved by us all—that in the midst of the darkness and night of the second day he stood almost within the enemy's lines under orders to retake his former position, and ordered his command, although they were a long way out of reach of his voice, as though present, with the successful purpose of retarding the enemy's movement until his own men could get there.

Howard seemed more calm and collected at headquarters under fire on the second day's battle, when explaining the position of his troops with reference to the withdrawal in *échelon* ordered, but not begun,*—stopped by Longstreet's attack on Sickles,—than he was standing on tiptoe, all aglow, listening to Gregg, or telling of his own movements so interestedly and energetically.

Sickles was more calm and unmoved on the second day's fight, when he came to the headquarters council called, but not held, for a joint understanding of the proposed movement, and announced the battle opening on his front, than he was sitting on the rocks at Little Round Top, listening to the story we asked the guide to tell as he told it to battlefield visitors. From the first-mentioned encounter Sickles was carried away minus a leg, but with lasting honor. He gained another crown of honor on our visit, in the thought of some of us, since he never mentioned his initiative and strong demand repeated to headquarters for the occupation of

* The original order-book of headquarters containing this order has been destroyed or lost, and is not at the War Department.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that position which caused Warren to be sent where his statue now stands.

Dear General Wright, gallant, quiet, modest to the extreme, was far less demonstrative in manner, language, and mood (not in force) so many years ago than he was when his quiet yet decided manner gave about the only corrective suggestion made during the day to the guide's story of any of the movements.

Newton's genial and calm temperament seemed, if anything, no less marked than when he said to Meade, to the latter's apparent disgust, on the evening of the second day's battle :

"General Meade, I think you ought to feel much gratified with to-day's results."

"In the name of common-sense, Newton, why?" was the inquiry in reply.

"Why," said Newton, with his pleasant expression and smile, "they have hammered us into a solid position they cannot whip us out of."

Doubleday's strength was sorely tested, invalid as he is, in the severe ascent to the belfry of the seminary. His clear and lucid description of Buford's work and his own on the first day of the fight, before and after Reynolds's death, and his explanation of the splendid *coup* of Robinson, with Wadsworth's and Fairchild's work, were interrupted and broken, but not impaired, by inability quickly to regain breath and strength after climbing such a height. He was much more quiet and composed during the battle days.

Gregg, with his courteous, high-bred manner, briefly described in the clearest way his brilliant cavalry fight. One would hardly have thought he was a participant, so modestly and tranquilly he spoke. He seemed not a day older nor a whit changed in any respect (save being in mufti) from the *beau sabreur* and quiet gentleman who always rode so tranquilly at the head of his command in or out of the fight.

At the visit to headquarters the scene and the discussions of the council of war on the night of the second day's battle were recalled. The recollections by all after so many years were in entire accord, with the slight exception that one commander thought Meade used the language, in expressing his opinion, that "Gettysburg was no place to fight a battle," instead of "Gettysburg is no place to fight a battle." The trifling difference was not worth discussion, since all agreed so closely.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

There were recollections, musings, regrets, on that day, not alone by the writer, but, I think, more or less by all. They would fill a volume, and would be of interest to survivors of that field.

There was a strong regret that the good people of Philadelphia or Pennsylvania had not placed the equestrian statue of Meade on that field, where it belongs, rather than in Fairmount Park. It was Meade's victory, as it would have been his defeat had it terminated in the enemy's favor. Everybody who goes there, and who will go, will always wish to see the commander as he was. Perhaps Pennsylvania will yet do it. What a group it would be to place in the field where the wooden observatory is, opposite the cemetery! Equestrian statues, life-size, of Meade, Reynolds, Hancock, Sedgwick, Wadsworth, Buford, Humphreys, Sykes, Birney, and others gone, as they were in life in that battle, and the gallant commanders yet living who will follow them to a future crown!

Whatever we may have thought in years agone, with less reflection and no knowledge of present results, speculation as to what might have occurred is but speculation. We know what the Army of the Potomac did at Malvern Hill after previous defeats, and we realize that our opponents were not to be undervalued for courage or tenacity. They proved it in our fighing days, as did their ancestry side by side with ours in the days of '76, at Yorktown, Saratoga, and the other fields of the Revolution. That they believed they were right, while we fought because we thought we knew they were wrong, passes unchallenged into history.

We cannot blame the prudence and conservative judgment that led Meade not to stake what, in case of failure, might perhaps have caused a fatal result to our Union. His great responsibility did not descend below the commander or to those of us who would have had it otherwise.

Some of us believe that it was a good Providence that endowed him with caution, if the consciousness of his grave responsibility did not of itself do it. We believe that his unquestioned bravery in obeying orders carried with it a saving and prudent judgment when he personally commanded; that it was better for the country, for all sides, that the fighting was not pushed for the conclusion and results we then thought and still think might have been possible, and that we can be profoundly grateful for the results as they stand to-day.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is not to be wondered at that there are many honestly mistaken as to the real effect and results of their own work in this battle, tactically of accident, strategically of purpose.

Many subordinate commanders to this day think their action won the battle, which would have been lost but for the combined work of all. It will never cease to be a regret to every true soldier that the full and just meed of recognition has not been given to all who deserved so much on that field.

There is no reason why the Illinois cavalryman should not have honestly supposed he was right when he marked the spot where he believed he fired the first shot of the battle about 7 A.M. July 1. He was ignorant of the fact that one of the 6th New York Cavalry had opened the fire some hours before at daylight. Although ordered not to fire at night, he reasoned that his orders not to fire during the night ended with daybreak, and he fired into the fog at the sound of the enemy's cavalry close to his picket post, though he could not see them—a lucky shot, in that it halted the advance of the enemy for the time. They could not see him. It added time for concentration.

It would be of great interest to know if the great and glorious soldier, Reynolds, who was fully apprised of Hooker's views and purposes, had in his mind the actual battlefield of the second and third days, and moved in front of it on that morning to give time for and cover the necessary concentration of our army, which he knew we could make by our distances as soon as, if not sooner than, Lee's entire army could. The battle-field memorial association will, we hope, some day, get light on many such points of interest. They have done and are doing excellent work.

It is not worth while to speculate upon a proposition to which there can never be an answer or positive solution. We could not rewrite the history of Europe if Wellington had been defeated at Waterloo, nor the result if we had failed at Gettysburg. Hence it is only speculation and opinion, with no certainty, as to what would have occurred had Lee adhered to the stated forecast of his campaign that it should be "strategically offensive" and "tactically defensive," leaving us to be the attacking party. We must always be grateful that Lee changed this. So theories or speculations as to the result had Hooker retained command are idle, as well as what would have occurred had Slocum been per-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mitted to enter upon the pursuit after Pickett's repulse, backed by a division of the Sixth Corps, as he was ready to do.

Nor need we speculate on the results if Sickles's position on the second day had not prevented Longstreet's junction with the force sent to our rear for that purpose or any withdrawal from our position, or on what result would have occurred if the magnetic, forceful, and impetuous Stonewall Jackson had been there commanding the force coöperating with Longstreet. We may on both sides cherish theories of results, but they are vain and idle. There are dangers before us now from virtually the same causes that brought on the War of the Rebellion—*avarice, greed, and selfishness*—that we may rather speculate upon with the hope to counteract.

We may, and we should be, profoundly thankful that results are as they now exist; more than grateful to the splendid, brave old Army of the Potomac, down to the last soldier on its fighting rolls, before, and at, and after the days of Gettysburg. It never proved more thoroughly or strongly its great discipline, organization, patriotism, and endurance than in those eventful days. Its memory and its lustre will never grow dim with us, and will always reflect with added brilliancy the glories of the armies of the West, of the Tennessee, the Cumberland (its glorious Western counterpart), and the Ohio. This light and lustre in all the armies came from the same source—the soldier in the ranks. He was always of good material, and ever showed it when trained and led by competent officers—sometimes without such leadership.

How appropriate here the words of our greatest soldier, Grant! How true!

"My sympathies are with every movement which aims to acknowledge our indebtedness to the private soldier—the countless, nameless, often disregarded, heroes of the musket and bayonet, to whose true patriotism, patient endurance, and fiery courage on the day of danger we who are generals owe victory, and the country will yet owe its salvation." (Grant's speech in 1863.)

Gettysburg, so often called the "soldiers' battle," appreciatively bears monuments from their States on the lines where they fought. We ought to place there monuments to mark the lines of our opponents, now, we trust, forever our fellow-citizens. The display of their great courage emphasizes that of our own brave men.

DANIEL BUTTERFIELD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# THE FUTURE OF THE SANDWICH ISLANDS.

BY CLAUS SPRECKELS.

THE death of King Kalakaua has aroused public interest in Hawaiian affairs. It was generally understood that the prime object of Kalakaua's visit to this country was to promote closer relations with the United States. His death while negotiations were pending was somewhat unfortunate, because it is not absolutely certain that the policy of the Hawaiian government under his successor will run on precisely the same lines. But while there is room for doubt on this head, there is also a reasonable probability that Kalakaua's death will not materially change the drift of public policy.

The Hawaiian Islands are American in sentiment and sympathy. Visitors from the United States to Honolulu feel themselves at home the moment they land from the steamer. There is nothing in the social conditions to remind them that they are on foreign soil. Hotels and stores are conducted on the American plan. American money is the circulating medium. Outdoor sports and popular amusements are fashioned on the American pattern, and the Fourth of July is a national holiday. Conversely, when a Hawaiian resident visits America, he finds himself at home in San Francisco or anywhere else in the United States.

The native Hawaiian people look to America as their best friend. They received their civilization from it, and they have constant intercourse with it. In other words, they know that their material prosperity depends upon the friendship of the United States. But they are impressionable and easily led. This is the weak point in Hawaiian affairs. It has been the cause of the recent trouble in the islands, and will continue to be a source of uncertainty and weakness while the Hawaiian natives continue to be influenced by their old traditions and customs.

There is a small but influential element on the islands which, if not exactly antipathetic, is not inclined to be favorably disposed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to American ascendency. This element may be grouped as representing British and German sentiment, while the Portuguese, by reason of their numbers and thrift, are fast acquiring political and commercial importance. At present the leaning of the Portuguese is toward America, but the sentiment is not very pronounced. The Japanese are likely to make their influence felt through their government, which, it has been hinted, would probably demand the suffrage for such of its people domiciled on the islands as may be able to comply with the requirements of the election law; but there is no danger of any interference from Tokio in the foreign relations of Hawaii with the United States or any other country. Should the Japanese receive the franchise, possibilities would be opened, however, for political combinations of various kinds, some of which might be inimical to American influence.

The Chinese form the remaining element in the Hawaiian Kingdom which might possibly become hostile to American supremacy. But the Chinese do not take any part in public affairs as a rule, although they took an opportunity of exhibiting their strength when it was proposed by the late reform government to initiate stringent anti-Chinese legislation. They assembled in public meeting and pronounced against the proposed legislation, and as a consequence it was quietly dropped. This incident gave the Chinese confidence in themselves, and they are not at all likely to abate one particle of their importance or pretensions. But Chinamen look upon all foreign countries with the same feelings of aversion, and therefore may be regarded as passive on any question that might arise in Hawaii between the United States and either England or Germany. I am inclined to think, all other things being equal, that the Chinese in Hawaii would give the preference to the United States. However, it must be remembered that the Chinese are a people who do not permit sentiment to influence them, and may therefore be expected to favor that which they think would pay best.

This brief statement of conflicting national sentiment on the Hawaiian Islands is necessary to a proper understanding of the situation there. It will be observed that the only potent factors, exclusive of native Hawaiians, are the American, British, and German nationalities. I have grouped the last two together for convenience, although they are very far from pursuing a common

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aim outside of business. As I have said, however, American influence greatly preponderates in every department of government and branch of industry. The banks of the kingdom are conducted by Americans. Of the capital invested in sugar plantations and mills, estimated at $29,665,990 in 1889, $22,537,210 belonged to Americans, $5,090,830 to British, $1,756,300 to Germans, and the balance to native Hawaiians and other nationalities. The carrying trade of the islands is in American hands, and the Pacific coast is the consuming and supply market for the entire Hawaiian group.

It is only natural, from a consideration of these facts, that American citizens should take a deep interest in Hawaiian affairs, and that the death of King Kalakaua at San Francisco, so soon after a native uprising in his capital, should cause anxious speculations as to the future. The late revolutionary movement, which resulted in the proclamation of an amended constitution, might, under favoring circumstances, be successfully imitated by the reactionary party, although Wilcox failed in his attempt: in that case how would American investments be affected? and would the United States government retain its influence over Hawaiian affairs? These questions have been asked frequently of late; and while it is not my purpose to attempt to answer them, for the reason that the future is uncertain, I do not hesitate to say that the chances are against any organized attempt to change existing political conditions. But much might be accomplished without resort to violence, and it is far more difficult to guard against a stealthy than against an open attack.

The commercial importance of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States cannot very well be overestimated, for the reason that their great natural resources are only beginning to be developed. And what has heretofore been accomplished has been mainly done by American skill, capital, and enterprise. The total foreign trade of the Hawaiian Kingdom in 1876, when the reciprocity treaty with the United States went into operation, was $3,811,187. The sugar export for that year was about 16,000 tons. For 1889, under the stimulus of limited reciprocity, the sugar export of the islands was about 125,000 tons, every pound of which was marketed in the United States, employing skilled labor in the refining business and dependent trades, while the total foreign commerce was $19,313,131, of which $13,972,579, or



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

72.34 per cent., was with the United States. The Collector-General of Customs of the Hawaiian Islands, in his annual report for 1889, says: "The trade with the United States has increased 5.78 per cent. during the year, and is now 79.10 per cent. of our entire imports. Our exports virtually all go to the United States. The United States received the bulk of our trade both in exports and imports; Great Britain received 3.45 per cent.; and China and Japan 1.10 per cent."

In the shipping trade of the Hawaiian Islands the American flag has the preference, and in this respect the Hawaiian trade is an exception worth noting. The Collector-General's returns for 1889, from which I quote, state the percentages of shipping employed in the foreign trade of the Hawaiian Kingdom as follows: "American, 72.34; Hawaiian (nearly all built on the Pacific coast), 19.19; British, 5.90; German, 2.04; all other, .53." The percentages of shipping for 1890, when published, will tell even better for the American flag. These figures emphasize the fact, however, that, while the stars and stripes are being driven from the high seas by foreign competition, the reciprocity treaty with Hawaii, a mere dot in the wide Pacific Ocean, has created a trade of which Americans have the virtual monopoly. Indeed, it is to this fact alone, and to the wise and far-seeing policy embodied in the Hawaiian treaty, that San Francisco ranks so high on the list of American ports for American shipping. Yet further, the commercial standing of San Francisco is very largely dependent upon its Hawaiian trade, as the following exhibit for 1890 will show:

| | EXPORTS TO. | IMPORTS FROM. |
|---|---|---|
| Hawaii | $4,179,311 | $12,363,450 |
| Central America | 1,789,046 | 3,012,517 |
| Mexico | 1,570,646 | 800,061 |
| Ecuador | 155,727 | 99,083 |
| Chile | 27,935 | 416,751 |
| China | 3,114,757 | 5,699,638 |
| Japan | 717,363 | 7,847,974 |
| Great Britain | 16,998,094 | 4,685,320 |
| British Columbia | 871,613 | 1,570,052 |
| Australasia | 1,402,316 | 1,195,047 |
| East India | 495,035 | 2,885,737 |
| France | 2,182,322 | 1,246,395 |
| French colonies | 353,951 | 213,107 |
| Belgium | 1,089,066 | 725,875 |
| Germany | 167,593 | 1,156,008 |
| Italy | ..... | 158,271 |
| Holland | 1,600 | ..... |
| Cuba | ..... | 407,306 |
| Philippines | 59,667 | 957,954 |
| Asiatic Russia | 128,937 | 416,751 |
| Brazil | 430,295 | ..... |
| Peru | 257,776 | ..... |
| Other countries | ..... | 58,727 |

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This exhibit demonstrates conclusively the great value of the Hawaiian trade to San Francisco and the country at large. It is of the utmost consequence, therefore, that it should be conserved and extended. There is no other instance on record where so large a trade has been developed with 80,000 people, which is about the total population of the Hawaiian Islands.

These figures, which deal with merchandise only, speak for themselves. They are more convincing than any argument I could use, if our public men would only condescend to consider them. They attest the commercial value of the Hawaiian Islands to the United States, and suggest that the true policy of this country is to strengthen, and not impair, American influence in Hawaiian affairs. The necessity for pursuing such an enlightened policy consistently and continuously must also suggest itself to thoughtful men when it is remembered that the Hawaiian Islands will become the key to the north Pacific Ocean upon the completion of the Nicaragua Canal, which will bring the maritime powers of Europe within striking distance of San Francisco. The power which holds Pearl Harbor, close to Honolulu, and is in direct communication with it by cable, will be mistress of the seas in the north Pacific.

The possession of Pearl Harbor as a naval station has been guaranteed to the United States government by treaty for a number of years. Why not improve the harbor and make this condition of occupation perpetual by treaty conferring perpetual reciprocal advantages upon Hawaii? The overshadowing influence of the United States in the industries and trade of the Hawaiian Islands renders it eminently proper that it should protect its commerce and the investment of its citizens against any possible combination or attack from without. This should not, and, indeed, need not, involve any attack upon the independence of the islands. No one could be more opposed to their annexation to the United States than I am. It could do no possible good, and might do a great deal of injury; but only good could result from the plan I have suggested. It would restore confidence in the stability of Hawaiian institutions, and stimulate industrial enterprise on the islands. This would necessarily react favorably upon American trade, and help to build up the shipping interests of this country, which are now at so low an ebb.

CLAUS SPRECKELS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# WHY WOMEN MARRY.

BY MRS. JOHN SHERWOOD.

It is a very difficult task to answer Mrs. Kate Gannett Wells's brilliant paper in the last number of The Review, because she goes on answering herself. I have always admired her gallant assault on an ethical problem, and find it difficult to break a lance with her. However, I differ honestly from one or two of her opinions, and shall endeavor to say so respectfully.

I do not believe prudence or "the original sinfulness of man" has ever kept a woman from marrying. Mrs. Wells says that "the working woman dreads man. She knows him as contractor, boss, night-fiend, betrayer, and she wants none of him." With this postulate I disagree. Who has not had a superior housemaid, nurse, or even nursery governess, who went wild over this "contractor, boss, night-fiend, and betrayer" and would marry him, willy nilly, and be poor, deserted, miserable, but fond and affectionate, ever after?

The immortal epic of Nancy Sykes tells the whole story. It is a sad truth. One hates to acknowledge it. Women love brutes; they adore strength; they love, as a dog does, the master, and, although civilization has brought in some terrible complications, there is something honorable and natural in this strange contradiction. The man should have just enough of the brute in him to kill, as Adam did, the deer for the family dinner. He should be able to knock something on the head—presumably not his wife. Even through all the grades, from Adam down to an English duke, women have in their secret hearts this adoration of masculine power, and I remember hearing at a dinner-table in London, three years ago, where the differences of a certain noble couple were being discussed (they had just gone through the divorce court), this remark from a delicate and elegant countess, who was a friend of the wife:

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"You see, Anastasia was one of those women who needed kicking down stairs, and Marmaduke was gentle; he was *not up to it.*"

This is putting it brutally; it is the plain English of it; but who does not know some dissatisfied woman of fashion who loathes her rather stupid husband, who does not know enough "*to kick her down stairs*"? That is, he has not inspired her with *a respect for his strength.* She ought to be (she wishes she could be) afraid of him, but she is sorry to acknowledge to her own heart that she is his superior. It saps her love for him. They are in a false position towards each other.

And rising above the housemaids and the nursery governess, do we not all know some gentle, superior, educated women who have loved and married men whom they knew to be gamblers, drunkards, and brutes? It is the superior woman who does this. Jane Eyre loved Rochester, although we see, who are looking on, that she was far his superior. He was simply masculinity on a black horse, the Centaur—sublime allegory of strength. He was her man of men. How splendidly the little Yorkshire woman pictures it for us in her noble English, as she paints the vapid manikins and womankins of fashion who gathered in that stately drawing-room. As Rochester tries to make love to one of them who would like to marry him for his money, we feel, all the time, how inferior she is to the plain little Jane in the corner in this great *power of loving*; aye, and we feel how illogical is Jane to love Rochester so much; but we respect her for it: it is womanly.

But Mrs. Wells will say, and very truly, that every woman is not a Jane Eyre; that some are so prudent and so selfish that they ask if half the husband's wage will be given to them; if it will not be more comfortable to live alone, and to save the money earned for one's self. These are very rare women. Did Mrs. Wells ever reason with a housemaid in love, or a schoolmistress, or a fashionable girl who wished to refuse fifteen millions and marry the man of her choice?

I do not agree with Mrs. Wells in the supposition that the higher education, or philanthropy, or the pursuit of an honorable profession drives out of a woman's head the idea of marriage. A profession is a refuge for a woman who has not been able to marry the man of her choice, or, having married him, has found him utterly uncongenial, or, as some witty woman said, "insupport-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

able, and therefore to be supported." I have seen the most educated, the busiest, and the most superior women, at forty years of age glad to marry some very inferior weak creature, so great a craving had their noble hearts for love. Women who are exceptionally strong can stifle this hunger of the heart. "It requires," said Miss Sedgwick, "a very superior woman to be an old maid. Almost anybody can be a good wife."

Higher education has opened much that gives dignity and peace to a woman who has missed her destiny, which is marriage; but it does not keep a "double first" from wishing to marry, although it does undoubtedly make her less attractive to men to be so "very superior."

For, to return to that savage idea of nature which makes the brutal man attractive, a man likes a woman to be his inferior. She must be as feminine as he is masculine, and the first claim of femininity is this: that the woman looks up to the man. Who that has read Mrs. Oliphant's excellent story of "Miss Majoribanks" but recalls half a dozen such very superior women of his own acquaintance who were wrecked as to marriage by their very superiority? The man felt that he could offer neither protection, assistance, nor help to these very superior creatures. I often hear of such women, who are apt to be heavily freighted with self-conceit. "Oh, she could have married anybody, but she does not wish to marry." I never believe this. I think the legend should read: "She would have married almost anybody if she could." I am sure, had I been a man, I should not have wished to marry her.

A woman who thus gives the idea that she is a law unto herself loses her power of attraction, and it is one argument against the half-education which we misname the higher education that it sometimes produces an unhappy mixture of this kind. The true education, the highest education, places a woman exactly on a level with her mate. She loves the man who is her superior. She adores his superiority of mind, as she rejoices in the bigness of his hands and the superior largeness of his feet, which give him the physical strength for a mountain climb or the power of pulling at the sails of his yacht. He and she are the complements of a perfect whole. That is the ideal marriage.

No doubt there are many women—very grand women they are, too—who, like Miss Martineau, refuse to marry for physical con-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

siderations—ill health ; the fear of hereditary disease ; the desire to save the beloved husband that should have been from unnecessary burdens. All honor to such women ; they are the silent martyrs. "'T is better to have loved and lost," etc. Such women are not unhappy.

But the sad reason why most women do not marry is because they have not had a chance. When we read that there are sixty thousand more unmarried women than men in Massachusetts alone, what shall we say of the rest of the so miscalled United States? Mrs. Wells wittily describes some one who had had "half an offer." It is to be feared that some most lovable women have not even reached to that dreadful moment of suspense. It is the "Lost Chord," and deeply to be deplored. It is true that in many a retired village some half-dozen very clever, well-educated, good women pass their lonely lives with no chance to "better their condition." No wonder that some of them make what their families call very bad marriages.

On one point I do agree with Mrs. Wells, when she refers to the horrible literature with which our market is flooded, turning life into a dissecting-room. That, indeed, may well frighten a susceptible and nervous woman. It is a shocking wrong and nuisance that popular magazines should publish stories which are read by young girls, enabling them, as Mrs. Wells says, to count "the various kinds of kisses which mark the advent and climax of a lover's regard. Love itself is just as subtle and unselfish as ever it was ; passion is as true and noble ; but their parasites are deadly." This is a splendid summing-up. But I do not agree that such reading makes a girl "love her mother more," or that she "stays at home," growing more healthful, and finding "indefinite interests enough to make single life very pleasant."

I fear the novels of to-day have had a very different result. This literature has had a vicious effect on the manners, if not on the morals, of our girls. It has led to the loud, unsexed, and vulgar product which we observe more in Europe than here. I do not think it has led to self-analysis, but to a demoralization of both young girls and young married women.

No doubt amongst the higher classes (if we have such a thing) the increased expense of living keeps many of the men from asking the women of their choice to marry them. So much the worse for the men. No factor in a man's fortune is so certain as a good

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

wife. If he fails, she can work. Women have proved during the last twenty years that they are a success as bread-winners. And where love goes before like a light in the pathway, who is such a tonic, when a man is down, as a good wife? Who will console him for the decline in stocks like the courageous creature who will say, "Never mind, Horatio, we can live in the country now: we *still have each other* and the children. Don't dare to say you are down while you have me and them, and now we will see what I can do"?

It would be worth several Baring Brothers' failures to have a woman say that. And do we not know many who have said it, and lived it too? Yes.

The great defect of the age is the lack of confidence between men and women on this point. Each should be thoroughly permeated with the idea of the other's happiness, and know that each is invaluable and necessary to the other.

In that sweetest of love-stories, "White Heather," we have the model girl, Meenie, who, rising above all the prejudices of caste, determines to marry her Ronald, and comes to Glasgow to save him from enlisting, and from going to the bad. She says, with a touch of wounded pride in her voice:

"Ronald, I have come all the way from the Highlands to save you."

And she tells him bravely that she was making no sacrifice to take him. She puts heart and hope into the brave, foolish fellow, of whom love has made a coward, and she consents to a Scotch marriage, under proper *chaperonage* (the idea of using this wretched French word under the shadow of Ben Loyal, and the Mudal, and Loch Naber, and Clebrig!), and these were halcyon days. The rich lover whom the ambitious sister wished Meenie to marry was sent to the right-about, for Meenie reasoned rightly that it was of no consequence to anybody but Ronald and herself whom she married; and so the rich lover was discarded. And Ronald turned out all right. Let all young ladies who hesitate about marrying the man whom they wish to marry read the beautiful, clean story of "White Heather," and, if they can find a Ronald, marry him on the spot.

It is a good book to read in these degenerate days, when "Love's Sacrifice" is out of date. It is a strong and healthy pulse which beats in the white wrist of Meenie. She knew that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with *her* Ronald would be a success, without *her* a failure; and love told her fortune with unerring accuracy.

To be sure, there was a rich American who helped along, but that does not make the moral less binding.

It would be better, no doubt, to have a dowry, to step into a well-furnished brown-stone house given by papa, to have a bank account on both sides; and then perhaps more of our girls would marry, if any sort of young man would ask them.

But when all that has happened to the fortunate young pair in whose pathway we strew roses, and around whom we crowd with congratulations, and ivory-bound prayer-books, we have still several millions of beating hearts unmated.

In this matter civilization has made a mistake. The birds and the squirrels make no such blunders. We do not hear of an old-maid nightingale singing to herself, forlornly, on a withered bough, nor of a selfish gray bachelor squirrel, going to his Union Club in an old oak-tree, eating his acorn, presumably served with truffles, all by himself.

To be sure, they neither of them have to consult Wall Street tickers or order Worth dresses.

Life with us is smothered in appliances. It could be very gay if it were not for its amusements, and very luxurious if it were not for its luxuries: both are overdone; and the first effect of our crude civilization is, with all our cleverness, to copy that which we ought to throw away, and to throw away that which is our peerless birthright. For if there ever was a country where young men and young women ought to marry for love, and to hope for a successful future, it is this country. We have seen that the rent-roll, the dowry, and the brown-stone house do not always bring happiness. We read every day that confession in the details of the divorce court. Therefore, why should not two strong young hearts say?—

"Never mind; whose happiness but yours and mine?"

Mrs. Wells says, wisely: "There are cycles and epochs in the civilizing processes of affection." It is to be feared that we are in a selfish cycle in which man desires marriage less than ever. Why he ever desired it has puzzled some absinthe-drinking Frenchmen.

We should be sorry to believe that woman was ever so untrue to herself as not to desire the fireside, the cradle, the cherub faces,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the infinite sacrifice and the infinite rewards of wifehood and motherhood. And we join with Mrs. Wells in saying: "The time will come when all noble women and men will be married."

For even the mistakes; the patient, brute-loving wife; the faithful, hopeful, weak husband, who waits and hopes; the sorrowful story of the imprudent marriage and its sad consequences; the foolish waiting and putting-off of marriage until fortune shall come, as if two could not court the fickle goddess better than one—even these mistakes and blunders prove that it is a "right road to travel," one we were all born to walk over on our upward path; and if any woman refuses to marry because of self-conceit, or because any learning or profession is better than marriage; if she regards selfish ease and the environment more than the man himself, then she is unworthy to read "White Heather," or even go a-salmon-fishing with that dear hero and heroine of William Black's best story.

I have not answered Mrs. Wells at all. She has still the fort untaken. Indeed, we neither of us know why our girls do not marry; we can only hope that they will "mend their ways," and imitate Mrs. Somerville when they are married, however superior they may be. For it is asserted that, while Mrs. Somerville's bureaus were full of diplomas, Dr. Somerville's buttons were always sewed on in the right place and his dinners were admirably served.

M. E. W. SHERWOOD.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# THE MENACE OF SILVER LEGISLATION.

BY THE HON. EDWARD O. LEECH, DIRECTOR OF THE MINT.

THE silver question is a part of that larger question of money and of the monetary standard, meaning by money an instrument which, in exchanges of services or commodities, serves as a *measure*, and is, in and of itself, an *equivalent*.

Time was when silver possessed the conditions necessary to fit it to serve as such a measure and equivalent. It does not possess them to-day.

The history of coinage legislation in the United States prior to 1878 was a series of blunders, in consequence of which, at no time prior to that date, did gold and silver coins of full debt-paying power circulate concurrently in this country. The first Coinage Act (April 2, 1792) fixed the relative value of the two metals, in coinage, at 15 of silver to 1 of gold. In this legal relation gold was undervalued; that is to say, the quantity of gold in the gold dollar was worth more than a dollar. The result was that gold coins did not circulate, but gold was shipped abroad in exchange for commodities at its commercial value.

To remedy this, the gold in the gold dollar was reduced by the act of 1834 (and the supplemental act of 1837) from 24.75 to 23.22 grains, at which it still remains. The quantity of silver in the silver dollar, as fixed by the act of 1792, remained unchanged. The ratio in coinage between the two metals was fixed at 1 to 15.988—practically 1 to 16. By this change silver was undervalued, and, in consequence, all our silver was shipped abroad, and gold was our only metallic currency. Indeed, in order to keep sufficient silver in the country for change purposes, Congress in 1853 reduced the weight of the divisional silver coins about 8½ per cent. and limited their debt-paying power, at the same time withdrawing from individuals the right to have such pieces coined.

From 1834 to the War of the Rebellion, when we went on a paper basis, gold constituted our only metallic currency. Theo-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

retically we had a double standard ; practically we had a single standard, of silver or of gold, from 1792 to 1861.

In the revision and codification of the coinage laws in 1873 the silver dollar, which was practically obsolete, was no longer authorized to be coined, and gold was made the sole standard of value.

In 1878, by what is commonly known as the "Bland Act," the coinage of the silver dollar, with full debt-paying power, was restored, not, however, for individuals, as prior to 1873, but on government account ; the law requiring the purchase, monthly, at the market price, and the coinage into silver dollars, of not less than two million nor more than four million dollars' worth of silver bullion. The minimum amount was purchased and coined.

From that period (February 28, 1878) until this provision of law was repealed by the act of July 14, 1890, the government of the United States bought 291,272,018 ounces of silver, at a cost of $308,199,261, and coined from such bullion 377,246,880 silver dollars, with a net profit, or "seigniorage," of about $67,000,000.

The present law (act of July 14, 1890) requires the purchase, monthly, at the market price, of four and a half million ounces of silver, of which two million ounces shall be coined, monthly, for the period of one year, into silver dollars ; after that date only such silver dollars need be coined as may be required for the redemption of the treasury notes issued in payment for the silver purchased. The silver dollars coined under these various acts since 1878, although not containing a dollar's worth of silver, have been maintained in domestic circulation at par with gold by causes not necessary now to be considered.

The silver question, as it now presents itself, means "free coinage of silver" in the United States concurrently with the free coinage of gold, at the ratio in coinage of 1 to 16 (exactly 1 to 15.988) ; that is, that individuals may take silver of any kind or description to the mints, and have every 371¼ grains stamped, free of charge, into a dollar, which dollar shall be a full legal-tender, for its face value, in the payment of debts and obligations of all kinds in the United States.

This is the right as to gold : why not as to silver ? There is an important difference. The minting of gold adds nothing to the value of the metal contained in the coin. It is simply a certificate to the public of the weight and purity of the piece. As a matter of fact, fine gold bars sell in New York at a slight premium

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

above full-weight gold coin, being preferred for shipment and industrial uses.

How is it with silver? The commercial, or bullion, value of the silver contained in the silver dollar is to-day 80 cents.* Here, then, is an important difference which did not exist prior to 1873, when we had free coinage of silver. In this difference lies the whole difficulty. Can it be overcome? Let us see.

Since 1873, when the United States adopted the gold standard, many important changes in respect to silver have taken place—changes we cannot ignore. They may be briefly enumerated as follows:

1. Silver has depreciated in value, as compared with gold, over 25 per cent.†

2. European nations have for thirteen years discontinued its coinage as full legal-tender money.‡

3. The exchanges of the world are settled everywhere in gold, or, if exchanges with silver-using countries, in silver at its gold value.

4. The annual product of silver has doubled.

In view of these changed conditions, is it possible for this country, acting in monetary isolation, by an act of legislative

* VALUE OF THE SILVER IN A SILVER DOLLAR AT THE AVERAGE PRICE OF SILVER EACH YEAR, 1873-1890.

| Calendar years. | Average price. | Calendar years. | Average price. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1873 | $1.004 | 1882 | $0.878 |
| 1874 | .988 | 1883 | .858 |
| 1875 | .964 | 1884 | .861 |
| 1876 | .894 | 1885 | .823 |
| 1877 | .929 | 1886 | .769 |
| 1878 | .891 | 1887 | .758 |
| 1879 | .868 | 1888 | .727 |
| 1880 | .886 | 1889 | .724 |
| 1881 | .881 | 1890 | .809 |

† AVERAGE COMMERCIAL PRICE OF SILVER BULLION PER FINE OUNCE EACH YEAR FROM 1872 TO 1890.

| Fiscal years. | Price. | Fiscal years. | Price. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1872 | $1.33445 | 1882 | $1.13799 |
| 1873 | 1.29888 | 1883 | 1.11889 |
| 1874 | 1.27827 | 1884 | 1.11560 |
| 1875 | 1.24676 | 1885 | 1.09117 |
| 1876 | 1.19500 | 1886 | 1.03388 |
| 1877 | 1.17250 | 1887 | 0.98439 |
| 1878 | 1.18641 | 1888 | 0.95782 |
| 1879 | 1.11875 | 1889 | 0.93537 |
| 1880 | 1.14162 | 1890 | 1.04673 |
| 1881 | 1.12957 | | |

‡ In 1871-73 laws were enacted in Germany by which gold was made the standard of value and silver demonetized. All silver coins which had previously been issued and received in the several states of the German Empire were called in. In order to procure the necessary gold for coinage purposes, Germany was forced to sell from time to time up to 1879 large quantities of silver from its store of melted coins, including the large amount received after the close of the Franco-Prussian War from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

power, to restore and maintain the value of silver at our coining rate, $1.29 an ounce—the present commercial value being $1.03 an ounce? and what would be the probable results of such legislation?

This would depend upon:

1. The action and disposition of foreign countries in regard to silver.

2. The quantity of silver which would come to our mints.

3. The extent to which gold would be withdrawn from the treasury of the United States and from active circulation by our own people.

I. If the International Monetary Conference, held in Paris during the French Exposition in 1889, proved anything, it was that, although there are a great many people in Europe who favor bimetallism, there is scarcely a European nation that would not, if it could, follow the example of England and adopt a gold monometallic system.

Gold monometallism is, indeed, the goal toward which all European countries are tending, and to obtain the gold they need they are only awaiting a favorable opportunity to exchange their silver for it. The passage of a free-coinage act by the United

France in payment of indemnity. The effect of this legislation was the creation of a demand for gold in Germany and an increase of the supply of silver bullion or melted coins in other countries, followed by a depreciation of the price of the latter metal.

Owing to the fact that it became profitable to brokers and exchange-dealers to purchase silver in Germany and send it to the states comprising the Latin Union (France, Belgium, Italy, Switzerland, and Greece), for coinage into silver 5-franc pieces, it was decided by the contracting parties in 1874 to limit the amount of 5-franc pieces to be coined by each. This, however, did not steady the price, and in 1878 the states of the Latin Union decided to close their mints to the coinage of full legal-tender silver, since which time this coinage has not been resumed.

The action of Germany in demonetizing silver was followed in December, 1872, by Norway, Sweden, and Denmark. These states entered into a monetary treaty, formally ratified by Denmark and Sweden in 1873 and by Norway in 1875, adopting the single gold standard and making silver subsidiary, to be coined only for change purposes.

In 1875, Holland, which had been on a silver basis from 1847, adopted the "double" standard nominally, at the anomalous ratio of 1 to 15⅝, but, in fact, prohibited the coinage of silver, thus practically going over to a gold basis.

By the law of September 9, 1876, Russia suspended the coinage of silver, except such as was necessary for trade with China.

In Austria-Hungary, while the silver standard legally prevails, gold only has been coined for individuals since 1879, except the coinage of Levant thalers, a trade silver coin.

So that it may be said that for the last thirteen years no silver coins of full debt-paying power have been struck for depositors in European mints.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States would afford that opportunity, since it would raise the price of silver temporarily to $1.29 per ounce. I say temporarily, for the ultimate effect of such legislation here would be to raise the price of gold the world over, by inducing countries that now have the double standard, or the single silver standard, to adopt the single gold standard, thus creating an increased demand for gold, and consequently causing it to appreciate in value; aggravating, in fact, the very evil complained of—the enhanced dearness of gold.

At the same time it would eventually lower the price of silver by enabling Europe to throw vast quantities of it on the American market. Europe wants gold; its ambition is to have a monetary system in which silver shall have no full legal-tender power; in which it will serve only as a divisional coin.

Let us glance at what silver Europe might throw upon the market if a sufficient inducement were offered by free coinage here.

The stock of full legal-tender silver coins—aside from all silver-change coins—in the ten principal countries of Europe is, approximately, $1,103,200,000.* Of this, the large and visible sum of $466,000,000 is stored in the vaults of nine banking-houses.†

Germany has still outstanding some $100,000,000 in old thalers, which she would be only too glad, we may assume, to sell, in order to perfect her monetary reform of 1871–73. It is only a question of time when Germany will sell her thalers, so as to make her monetary system as completely gold monometallic as England's, which she is imitating.

*APPROXIMATE STOCK OF FULL LEGAL-TENDER SILVER COIN IN EUROPE.

| Countries. | Full legal-tender silver coins. | Countries. | Full legal-tender silver coins. |
|---|---|---|---|
| France | $650,000,000 | Austria-Hungary | 90,000,000 |
| Germany | 102,000,000 | Netherlands | 61,800,000 |
| Belgium | 48,400,000 | Russia | 22,000,000 |
| Italy | 25,800,000 | Greece | 1,800,000 |
| Switzerland | 11,400,000 | | |
| Spain | 90,000,000 | Total | $1,103,200,000 |

†SPECIE HOLDINGS OF THE PRINCIPAL EUROPEAN BANKS.

| Banks. | Gold. | Silver. | Total. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Of England | $122,361,923 | | $122,361,923 |
| Of France | 220,481,649 | $241,952,647 | 462,434,296 |
| Of Germany | 132,576,439 | 66,288,217 | 198,864,656 |
| Of Austria-Hungary | 26,376,430 | 80,633,039 | 107,009,469 |
| Of Netherlands | 17,027,883 | 26,464,027 | 43,491,910 |
| Of Belgium | 13,175,236 | 6,587,620 | 19,762,856 |
| Of Switzerland | 11,853,063 | 4,530,833 | 16,383,896 |
| Of Spain | 19,782,287 | 24,982,416 | 44,764,703 |
| Of Italy | 60,000,000 | [1] 15,000,000 | 75,000,000 |
| Total | $623,634,910 | $466,438,799 | $1,090,073,709 |

[1] Distributed in proportion to the holdings at the end of 1886.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Austria-Hungary, which has by law the silver standard, but actually an irredeemable paper currency, is actively agitating the resumption of specie payments on the gold standard. She cannot resume on the silver standard for the reason that her silver coins are, even now, less valuable than the paper currency. There are about 166,000,000 silver florins in the Bank of Austria-Hungary, and, according to public prints, the intention is to sell 60,000,000 (about $25,000,000) of these in order to procure gold.

The Italian government has some 44,000,000 lire (or francs) in Bourbon piasters, about $8,500,000, which are looking for a market.

Roumania only a few months since sold some 25,000,000 lei (or francs)—about $5,000,000—of full legal-tender silver coins at a ridiculously low price—about $1.06 an ounce—and has 22,000,000, or about $4,400,000, more, which it is anxious to dispose of.

It has been publicly stated that only recently agents of the Netherlands were trying to dispose of its stock of silver through New York bankers.

Again, the Belgian press has recently been urging the government of that country to sell the Belgian francs, about $20,000,000, in the vaults of the Bank of France, which would have to be redeemed in gold if the Latin Union were terminated.

II. So much for stocks of European silver coin which might, and it is believed would, come to our mints under free coinage, if the price was maintained.

Let us glance at the current product of silver from the mines, which we would certainly have to deal with.

The product of silver from the mines of the world during the calendar year 1889—the last year for which statistics have been compiled—was, approximately, 124,769,000 ounces, of the value, at our coining rate, of $161,318,000.

This total embraces only such silver products as have been officially reported, or which are known from exports of silver from silver-producing countries to have been produced. How much more was produced, and is not a matter of record, it is impossible to say; but doubtless the amount was very considerable.

In South America, which is a large silver-producing region, no sort of statistics of the product of the mines is compiled, especially in Bolivia, which is the largest silver-producer of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

South American republics. So that the total recorded output of silver is, no doubt, below the actual product.

It is believed that, owing to the stimulus to mining industries by the increased price of silver and lead, which are nearly always found in combination,—a stimulus the result of recent legislation,—the output of our own mines, and probably of the mines of Mexico and South America, was increased during the last year (1890).

The product of silver in Australasia has largely increased during the last year or two, owing to the discovery of valuable silver-lead properties. In New South Wales silver was not found in any great quantities until recently, when rich fields were discovered in the "Barrier Ranges." It is safe to say that the product of silver in the "Broken Hill" district alone, for the year 1890, will aggregate 8,000,000 ounces.

So that the product of silver in the world for the calendar year 1890 will probably approximate 130,000,000 ounces, or $168,000,000 at our coining rate.

The product of silver has more than doubled since 1873, as will be seen from the following table:

PRODUCT OF SILVER IN THE WORLD DURING EACH CALENDAR YEAR, 1873-90.

| Calendar years. | Fine ounces. (Troy.) | Commercial value. | U. S. coining value. |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1873 | 63,267,000 | $82,120,000 | $81,800,000 |
| 1874 | 55,300,000 | 70,673,000 | 71,500,000 |
| 1875 | 62,262,000 | 77,578,000 | 80,500,000 |
| 1876 | 67,753,000 | 78,322,000 | 87,600,000 |
| 1877 | 62,648,000 | 75,240,000 | 81,000,000 |
| 1878 | 73,476,000 | 84,644,000 | 95,000,000 |
| 1879 | 74,250,000 | 83,383,000 | 96,000,000 |
| 1880 | 74,791,000 | 85,636,000 | 96,700,000 |
| 1881 | 78,890,000 | 89,777,000 | 102,000,000 |
| 1882 | 86,470,000 | 98,230,000 | 111,800,000 |
| 1883 | 89,177,000 | 98,986,000 | 115,300,000 |
| 1884 | 81,597,000 | 90,817,000 | 105,500,000 |
| 1885 | 91,652,000 | 97,564,000 | 118,500,000 |
| 1886 | 93,276,000 | 92,772,000 | 120,600,000 |
| 1887 | 96,141,000 | 94,048,000 | 124,304,000 |
| 1888 | 108,888,000 | 102,243,000 | 140,784,000 |
| 1889 | 124,769,000 | 116,674,000 | 161,318,000 |
| 1890 (estimated) | 130,000,000 | 136,500,000 | 168,000,000 |

That the annual product of foreign as well as domestic silver would find its way to our open mints under free coinage, so long as we could maintain the price in gold, there can be little doubt. As indicative of this, it may be said that from May 1, 1890, to the close of last December—the period of congressional silver legislation—the commercial value of silver imported into the United States was $22,841,429; of silver exported (only about half of



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which was domestic bars), $15,346,156; a net gain of foreign silver of $7,495,273.

Since the passage of a law increasing the purchases of silver by this government to 4,500,000 ounces a month so stimulated the price here as to invite nearly $8,000,000 worth of foreign silver, and to stop the export of domestic silver, it requires no stretch of imagination to see that if the United States should by legislation offer to pay $1.29 per ounce (the equivalent of our coining rate), without limit as to quantity, it would naturally attract to its mints the entire silver product of the world, just as long as we could maintain that gold price.

It could go nowhere else. The mints of Europe are closed to it. The mints of Mexico are open to it, but the stamp of that republic adds no value to the twenty-odd millions of pesos which are annually coined, and they go fresh from the presses of the mints into the melting-pots of India and the United States. With the exception of the annual absorption of silver by India (the great silver sink of the world) to the extent of $40,000,000,—where the surplus silver product has heretofore gone,—there is no actual demand for silver for coinage purposes by civilized nations, and the artificial price created by our legislation would naturally and certainly attract the product here in exchange for our gold, as long as that artificial price was maintained.

It is important to observe that the conversion of silver into silver dollars by free coinage *proper* would be limited to the capacity of the mints—three and half million pieces a month, working regular hours, or working night and day, say five million pieces.

The bill which passed the Senate, and is now pending in the House, hastens the effects of free coinage by providing for the *instantaneous* conversion of bullion into legal-tender forms of money.

Is it conceivable that the invitation to the owners of silver throughout the world to exchange, in this expeditious way, 371¼ grains of silver, now worth less than 80 cents, for our gold dollar, worth everywhere 100 cents, would not be heeded? But it must be borne in mind that the enhanced value of silver is but a temporary gain, and vanishes as it is sought after. How long, under such conditions, would we be able to maintain gold payments?

III. The stock of gold in the United States was, on the first of February of this year, approximately, $708,000,000. With this

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

immense stock, larger than that of any other country in the world except France, we have been enabled to keep in circulation, concurrently with our gold coins, 391,566,005 silver dollars, coined since 1878, or their paper representatives.

Of the stock of gold, $297,567,000 is in treasury vaults, of which $155,839,000 is held for the redemption of gold certificates outstanding, issued on deposits of gold coin with the treasury. The remainder, $410,433,000, is in banks and scattered over the country.

If we should exchange this stock of gold for a stock of silver, which would most surely and swiftly take place, were it not rendered impossible by the withdrawal of gold from the treasury and from circulation, what would we gain?

One of two things must certainly occur: either our gold will be hoarded by banks, trust companies, and individuals, or it will go abroad to pay for the silver which will be shipped here for sale. In either event we should reach a silver basis.

What does a silver basis mean? It means that the paying power of our money in foreign exchanges would be depreciated to the commercial value of the silver in our dollar.

We have an object-lesson in our near neighbor, Mexico. Mexico is on a silver basis, and the consequence is that the Mexican silver dollar, although it contains more silver than our dollar, has a purchasing power in foreign exchanges equal only to its value as silver bullion.

But, it is said, this country is suffering from a scarcity of money, which the free coinage of silver will relieve. This is not sustained by the facts.

The amount of money in actual circulation in the United States has increased during the last twenty years $727,000,000, a *per-capita* increase of about $5. There is more money in use to-day in the United States,* both in the aggregate and *per capita*, than ever before in the history of this country, and more than in any European country, except France, where the people

* AMOUNT OF MONEY IN ACTUAL CIRCULATION IN THE UNITED STATES FEBRUARY 1, 1891.

| | |
|---|---|
| Gold coin and gold certificates | $565,280,785 |
| Standard silver dollars and silver certificates | 368,663,035 |
| Subsidiary silver coin | 57,723,629 |
| Greenbacks, treasury notes, and national-bank notes | 534,088,802 |
| Total | $1,525,756,251 |

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have not accommodated themselves to the use of checks and other substitutes for money to the same extent as in other great commercial countries.

Moreover, from a recent investigation made by the Comptroller of the Currency, it is shown that about 92 per cent. of the business of the banks is done with substitutes for money—checks, drafts, etc.—and only about 8 per cent. in cash.

The greatest fallacy in the free-coinage argument is that through the influx of large quantities of silver the volume of our circulating medium would be increased. That it would change the basis of our currency from gold to silver there can be but little doubt, but that it would increase the volume of money, or permanently increase the price of silver, is open to serious question.

The movement of the precious metals from one country to another is not regulated by statute or open mints, but is purely a business transaction. They move only when it is profitable.

Just as long as it was profitable to ship silver to the United States—that is, just as long as it would bring a higher price here than elsewhere—silver would come. But it would not come when the shipment ceased to be profitable. If our mints should be open to the free coinage of silver, the stocks of silver would move to this country solely because they could be converted, at the highest market price, into our legal-tender money, which could, in turn, be converted into gold at par; but the moment our currency reached a silver basis, when our legal-tender paper money could only be exchanged for silver dollars, the profit to the foreign bullion-owner for the interchange of his silver for our gold would cease, and silver would be imported then only as an exchange matter, just as gold is now.

If, then, silver ceased to come here because it was not profitable to ship it and receive payment in dollars whose purchasing power would only be equal to the value of the metal contained in them, which is sure to happen if we reach a silver basis, where would be the gain in the volume of our currency?

Further increases of circulation are provided for by the existing law, under which the government is required to purchase, at the market price, 54,000,000 ounces of silver a year, payment to be made in legal-tender paper money redeemable in coin. This will have the double effect of adding about $60,000,000 a year to the circulation and sustaining the price of silver, without further im-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TABLE EXHIBITING APPROXIMATELY THE STOCK OF MONEY IN THE AGGREGATE AND PER CAPITA IN THE PRINCIPAL COUNTRIES OF THE WORLD, THE STANDARD OF VALUE IN EACH, AND THE RATIO OF GOLD AND SILVER IN COINAGE.

| COUNTRIES. | Population. | Standard. | Stock of gold. | Stock of silver. | | | Uncovered paper. | Per capita. | | | | Ratio of silver to gold in coinage.† |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | Full legal-tender. | Limited tender. | Total. | | Gold. | Silver. | Paper. | Total. | |
| United States | 64,000,000 | Bimetallic. | $708,000,000 | $391,566,000 | $77,696,000 | $469,262,000 | ¶ $434,088,000 | $11.06 | $7.33 | $6.78 | $25.17 | 1—15.9883 |
| United Kingdom | 38,165,000 | Gold. | 550,000,000 | ..... | 100,000,000 | 100,000,000 | 64,000,000 | 14.41 | 2.62 | 1.57 | 18.60 | 1—14.28 |
| France | 38,250,000 | ‡Bimetallic. | 900,000,000 | 650,000,000 | 50,000,000 | 700,000,000 | 96,000,000 | 23.53 | 18.30 | 2.72 | 44.55 | 1—15.5 |
| Germany | 48,000,000 | Gold. | 500,000,000 | 102,000,000 | 43,000,000 | 145,000,000 | 160,000,000 | 10 42 | 4 48 | 3.12 | 18.02 | 1—13.957 |
| Belgium | 6,100,000 | ‡Bimetallic. | 65,000,000 | 48,400,000 | 6,600,000 | 55,000,000 | 54,000,000 | 10.66 | 9.02 | 8.85 | 28.53 | 1—15.5 |
| Italy | 31,000,000 | ‡ do. | 140,000,000 | 25,800,000 | 34,200,000 | 60,000,000 | 211,000,000 | 4.51 | 1.94 | 6.81 | 13.26 | 1—15.5 |
| Switzerland | 3,000,000 | ‡ do. | 15,000,000 | 11,400,000 | 3,600,000 | 15,000,000 | 14,000,000 | 5.00 | 5.00 | 4.67 | 14.67 | 1—15.5 |
| Greece | 2,200,000 | ‡ do. | 2,000,000 | 1,800,000 | 2,200,000 | 4,000,000 | 14,000,000 | .91 | 1.82 | 6.36 | 9.09 | 1—15.5 |
| Spain | 18,000,000 | ‡ do. | 100,000,000 | 90,000,000 | 35,000,000 | 125,000,000 | 94,000,000 | 5.56 | 6.94 | 5.22 | 17.72 | 1—15.5 |
| Portugal | 5,000,000 | Gold. | 40,000,000 | ..... | 10,000,000 | 10,000,000 | 6,000,000 | 8.00 | 2.00 | 1.20 | 11.20 | 1—14.38 |
| Austria-Hungary | 40,000,000 | Silver. | 40,000,000 | 90,000,000 | ..... | 90,000,000 | 260,000,000 | 1.00 | 2.25 | 6.50 | 9.75 | 1—15.3 |
| Netherlands | 4,500,000 | ‡Bimetallic. | 25,000,000 | 61,800,000 | 3,200,000 | 65,000,000 | 40,000,000 | 5.55 | 14.44 | 8.89 | 28.88 | 1—15.5 |
| Scandinavian U'n. | 8,600,000 | Gold. | 32,000,000 | ..... | 10,000,000 | 10,000,000 | 27,000,000 | 3.72 | 1.16 | 3.14 | 8.02 | 1—14.08 |
| Russia | 113,000,000 | Silver. | 190,000,000 | 22,000,000 | 38,000,000 | 60,000,000 | 500,000,000 | 1.68 | .53 | 4.42 | 6.63 | 1—15.5 |
| Turkey | 33,000,000 | Gold. | 50,000,000 | ..... | 45,000,000 | 45,000,000 | ..... | 1.52 | 1.36 | ..... | 2.88 | 1—15.1 |
| Australia | 4,000,000 | do. | 100,000,000 | ..... | 7,000,000 | 7,000,000 | ..... | 25.00 | 1.75 | ..... | 26.75 | 1—14.28 |
| Egypt | 7,000,000 | do. | 100,000,000 | ..... | 15,000,000 | 15,000,000 | ..... | 14.29 | 2.14 | ..... | 16.43 | 1—15.61 |
| Mexico | 11,600,000 | Silver. | 5,000,000 | 50,000,000 | ..... | 50,000,000 | 2,000,000 | .43 | 4.31 | .17 | 4.91 | 1—16.5 |
| Central America | 3,000,000 | do. | ..... | 500,000 | ..... | 500,000 | 2,000,000 | ..... | .17 | .67 | .84 | 1—15.5 |
| South America | 35,000,000 | * do. | 45,000,000 | 25,000,000 | ..... | 25,000,000 | 300,000,000 | 1.29 | .71 | 8.57 | 10.57 | 1—15.5 |
| Japan | 40,000,000 | Bimetallic. | 90,000,000 | 50,000,000 | ..... | 50,000,000 | 56,000,000 | 2.25 | 1.25 | 1.40 | 4.90 | 1—16.18 |
| India § | 255,000,000 | do. | ..... | 900,000,000 | ..... | 900,000,000 | 28,000,000 | ..... | 3.53 | .11 | 3.64 | 1—15 |
| China § | 400,000,000 | do. | ..... | 700,000,000 | ..... | 700,000,000 | ..... | ..... | 1.75 | ..... | 1.75 | ..... |
| The Straits § | ..... | do. | ..... | 100,000,000 | ..... | 100,000,000 | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... | ..... |
| Canada | 4,500,000 | Gold. | 16,000,000 | ..... | 5,000,000 | 5,000,000 | 40,000,000 | 3.56 | 1.11 | 8.89 | 13.56 | 1—14.95 |
| Cuba, Hayti, etc. | 2,000,000 | Bimetallic. | 20,000,000 | 1,200,000 | 800,000 | 2,000,000 | 40,000,000 | 10.00 | 1.00 | 20.00 | 31.00 | 1—15.5** |
| | | | $3,733,000,000 | $3,321,466,000 | $486,296,000 | $3,807,762,000 | ¶ 2,442,088,000 | | | | | |

* Except Brazil, which is gold. ** Hayti. † In countries where silver is a full legal-tender the ratio is given between gold coins and full legal-tender coins. In countries where silver is only a limited tender the ratio is given between gold and limited-tender silver coins. ‡ Coinage of full legal-tender silver suspended. ¶ Greenbacks, treasury notes, and national-bank notes outstanding, less $100,000,000 gold held for redemption. § The stock of silver in India, China, and the Straits settlements is not susceptible of even approximate determination. The figures presented in the table are a mere guess based upon the movement of silver to these countries for a series of years, and agree substantially with the guess of the best European statisticians.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

perilling the chances of a monetary agreement with other nations, which is the only true solution of the silver question. Free coinage upon our part, at our ratio of 16 to 1, would be an absolute barrier to such an agreement.

The suggestion of an international monetary agreement is too often looked upon as an evasion; but, we repeat, it is the only solution.

It was by the combined action of various nations in discontinuing the use of silver as money that the link was broken between silver and gold. It will be only by the combined action of nations of sufficient commercial importance to maintain a ratio that the link will be united.

We may yet entertain the hope of such concerted action. Eventually the embarrassments arising from the attempt to use one metal alone as the measure of value and the medium of exchanges may become so intolerable that commercial nations may find it to their advantage to join the United States in the remonetization of silver.

The table on the preceding page, which has been compiled from the latest official and other reliable data, is presented as an *approximate* exhibit of the stock of gold, silver, and "uncovered" paper money in the principal countries of the world, the metallic standard of each, and the legal ratio between gold and silver in coinage in each.

EDWARD OWEN LEECH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# SELF-CONTROL IN CURING INSANITY.

BY WILLIAM A. HAMMOND, M. D., SURGEON-GENERAL, U. S. A. (RETIRED).

THERE is no one whose mental development is such as to render him capable of being influenced by passion or guided by reason who has not at times felt himself impelled to the performance of acts which he knew to be wrong according to the standard of expedience or morality by which he had been accustomed to be governed. Should he have yielded to the emotional disturbance or the imperfect ideation of the moment, he has, when his feelings have been assuaged and reason has resumed its sway, become aware of the fact that he had during the whole period of his mental perturbation the power to modify his conduct or to refrain altogether from action, had he exerted his will to the requisite extent. How far this volitional control is normal or abnormal is a question extremely difficult of solution; but there is no doubt that the will is one of the most uncultivated of all the mental faculties, and that it is capable of a degree of development far in excess of that which is commonly exhibited even by persons of marked intellectual ability.

If this is true of those who are ordinarily regarded as sane, it is equally true of most of those whom science has declared to be lunatics. Of course there is in some of the insane such a degree of structural disease of the brain as absolutely to destroy many of the more important of the mental faculties, the will among them. Such persons do not come within the scope of the present discussion.

But there are others in whom no such disorganization can be presumed to exist, and yet who, when left to themselves, to be guided by their own minds, exhibit the most unbridled passions, pursue the most absurd trains of thought, and perpetrate acts which are in direct violation of all the laws of God and man. In many cases it is impossible to determine which of these are sane and which insane. There is no infallible law which is applicable alike to both classes. Neurologists and alienists decide accord-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing to their preconceived views, pronouncing some to be of normal mental organization and some of abnormal, but giving us no test for our guidance, and often differing among themselves in regard to some one particular instance. That many, if not a majority, of these mentally-depraved persons, whether sane or insane, are capable of regulating their feelings, their ideas, and their conduct by a standard more in accordance with that by which right-minded persons are guided is a matter in regard to which I do not believe a reasonable doubt exists.

If there is anything which has been taught to us by the most advanced stage of science as applied to the anatomy, the physiology, and the pathology of the brain, it is the fact that the utmost degree of mental aberration may exist without there being the slightest change perceptible to our senses in the normal structure of the central organ of the mind. Of course there is some alteration, such, for instance, as a pernicious education may effect, or such as may be induced by indulgence in ignoble emotions, degrading trains of thought, or vicious practices; but it is so slight and perhaps so evanescent as to be entirely beyond the reach not only of our unaided senses, but of all the instruments of precision or of analytical processes that are at the present day at our disposal. The brain, therefore, of the most pronounced lunatic may not differ, so far as we can perceive, from that of one who during life had stood at the very summit of human mental development. At birth the two brains might have been identical, not only in all the elements that entered into their composition, but also in their tendencies and proclivities. One, however, started in the course of life under disadvantageous circumstances; the other had everything in its favor. One was left to its own guidance and to the influence of circumstances detrimental to its well-being; the other amid beneficial surroundings was carefully trained and developed. Would it be a matter of surprise if the possessor of the one should be an enemy of society and a perpetrator of acts of fraud and violence, and the other a leader in all honorable and virtuous purposes?

But while all this is true, it is equally certain that the reprobate and villain is susceptible of being acted upon by sufficiently stringent motives; of regulating his thoughts and conduct in accordance with a system foreign to that habitual with him, and of guiding himself through courses different from those to which he

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has been accustomed. Otherwise the criminal should not be punished, no matter how inimical he may be to the welfare of the body politic, but is to be compassionated and tenderly cared for, and, at most, subjected to such restraint only as will suffice to protect society from his depredations. From this stand-point he is not to blame for a dissolute or infamous life, for he cannot help himself and is only following impulses for which he is not responsible. Efforts to reform him should not be undertaken; for why attempt to alter a mental constitution due to an abnormal brain, which is as much a part of his identity as is the color of his eyes or the contour of his face?

Undoubtedly he can be changed, and this change must necessarily be effected through an alteration in the cerebral organization from which his mind is evolved. He changes himself through the influence of motives stronger, for the time being at least, than those that originally governed him and rendered him wicked and depraved.

Many persons recognized by those familiar with the subject of mental alienation in all its phases to be insane are rendered so by yielding little by little to impulses which they know to be wrong, but which it is unpleasant or difficult to resist. Their will-power, undeveloped by proper education, becomes weaker with each act of yielding; whereas, if they had controlled themselves in the beginning, volitional strength, and not volitional debility, would have been the result. Principles not perhaps very deeply ingrafted in the first instance are cast aside; scruples arising from early education are disregarded, not without some difficulty in the beginning, for with such people, as with all others, *c'est le premier pas qui coute.* But finally a trifling emotion or a transient desire suffices, so that delusions become more or less fixed and impulses more or less powerful. Error in one or several directions, undistinguishable from truth, is established, and the will gives way without an effort at resistance. Acts of violence are committed from trifling motives; the plea of insanity is brought forward; and the perpetrator, if he does not entirely escape, suffers some light punishment, altogether inadequate to the gravity of his offence.

An instance in point is that of the lunatic who a few months since murdered one of the medical officers of the Flatbush Lunatic Asylum. The man Dougherty, as long ago as 1884, was employed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by a telegraph company at Scranton, Penn., though considered very much of a crank. He said he had invented the Dougherty motor, which he advertised and described as "a finite machine that will use the great, perpetual, unlimited, infinite power that moves, lights, and heats the universe. Planetary magnetism, the great divine law of attraction and repulsion, the principles upon which it is built, explained by the discoverer and inventor." Then he had some trouble, still being in the employment of the telegraph company, about his pay. He wrote to the president that, unless his money were forthcoming on a certain day, he would "demoralize things." The money did not arrive on the day named; so he armed himself, barricaded the doors and windows of the office, cut the wires, and held full sway for three days. At the end of this time he was overpowered and arrested, but the case was soon settled, and in a few days he was allowed to go free.

But he went on from bad to worse. He imagined himself very much in love with a distinguished actress, wrote her many letters, crossed the ocean to visit her, travelled on the trains with her, presented her with an enormous bouquet, and made her a speech full of the most exaggerated sentiment. His attentions became so annoying that finally the lady reported the case to the police, and he was arrested in the lobby of a theatre in New York. When searched, a large loaded revolver was found on him, which he said he carried to protect himself from a "crew of devils" who, he declared, were trying to steal the lady's love from him. Not until then was he adjudged insane and dangerous, and committed to a lunatic asylum, from which, however, he soon escaped by fitting a key to a door. Two weeks afterwards he suddenly appeared in the superintendent's office and, pointing a pistol at the physician's head, demanded certain articles of clothing which he had left behind. The superintendent, although he was covered by the man's pistol the entire time, acted with great coolness and presence of mind, and, summoning an attendant, directed him to bring the articles asked for. Dougherty, after getting the bundle, made a bow and walked away.

Now, up to this time there seems to have been no serious idea entertained by any one that this man was insane. It is true that he was arrested and committed to an asylum as "insane and dangerous," but this was evidently only for the purpose of pro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tecting a lady from annoyance and of getting rid of a troublesome fellow. Certainly the superintendent of the asylum in which he had been confined did not consider him a lunatic, although he entered that gentleman's office and pointed a pistol at his head. It was not until a few days subsequently, when he again visited the office with a pistol in each hand and, without the slightest provocation, killed the assistant superintendent, that the idea seems to have been definitely formed that he was a lunatic. He shot the physician twice, instantly killing him, and then coolly walked away. Doubtless he will suffer no inconvenience other than being again confined in a lunatic asylum, to be discharged when in the opinion of the authorities he has recovered his reason.*

I venture to assert, as the result of much experience with such people as Dougherty, and many conversations with them, that at all times during the manifestation of what in the beginning was mere eccentricity of conduct, all through his violent acts and his emotional disturbance down to the perpetration of an unprovoked murder, he might have controlled himself had he been so disposed, and, in my opinion, he ought to be executed in the manner provided by law for other criminals.

Many cases in illustration of this opinion have been reported by medical writers. Without further referring to them I will cite the following, which have occurred in my own experience:

Upon one occasion a young man consulted me for symptoms indicating cerebral congestion. He had pain in his head, dizziness, and was unable to sleep. He informed me that he had been for several months constantly troubled by a force, which was inexplicable to him, to kill a friend who was employed in the same office with him. Once he had gone so far as secretly to put strychnia into a mug of ale, which he had invited the young man to drink; but just as the intended victim was raising the vessel to his lips my visitor had, as if by accident, knocked it out of his friend's hand. Every morning he awoke with the impulse so strong upon him that he felt certain he would carry it out before the day closed; but he had always been able to overcome it. This young man reasoned perfectly well in regard to his impulse, and very candidly admitted, and I entirely agreed with him, that,

* Since this was written Dougherty has been tried, and, in consequence of insanity, was found guilty of a minor degree of murder, and sentenced to life imprisonment. Additional proceedings have, however, been instituted, and it is probable that even this comparatively light sentence will be set aside.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

if he had yielded and committed the murder, he ought to have been punished to the full extent of the law.

Undoubtedly, if this person had been encouraged to the slightest extent by the idea that he could, by reason of insanity, perpetrate murder with impunity, he would have acted in accordance with his impulse. It was, as he informed me, the fear of the consequences that had restrained him; but, meeting with no sympathy from me, he obtained permanent mastery over himself and abandoned the idea altogether.

The following extract from a letter which I received several years ago is likewise to the point:

"In the New York *Sun* of the 30th inst. I noticed the proceedings of the Medico-Legal Society, in the College of Physicians and Surgeons, on emotional insanity, etc., and I was impressed particularly with your remarks on 'Morbid Impulse.' Some two weeks since I was at work in my garden with a spade, and one of my little girl children, just three years old, came in where I was, and I was suddenly seized with an impulse to kill the child with the spade that I was at work with, and in order to prevent my doing so I had to make her leave the garden. Now, I love this child better than I do the apple of my eye, and why I was seized with that impulse I can't say. Since that time I have been feeling strange, and I am afraid to trust myself with my own family, though I know perfectly well what I am doing, and only feel actuated by these impulses. I have consulted a physician, and he laughed at me. If you can suggest any remedy for these strange impulses, I will pay you what you charge, and will consider that you have done me a favor that will *cause me to bless your name forever*. I don't consider that I am in any danger of murdering any one just yet, but the idea of such a thing is horrible, and I fear it may grow on me unless remedied."

In my reply I called the writer's attention to the admitted fact that he had his impulse under control; that he was able to reason calmly and intelligently in regard to it; that he had applied to me for advice, and that I urged him to place himself without delay under the restraint of an asylum. I further told him that if he disregarded this advice, and finally yielded to his impulse, he would be fully as guilty of murder as if he had killed through deliberate malice, and that he ought to be just as surely executed as any other murderer.

In regard to certain lunatics Dr. Carpenter * says:

"Nothing else is requisite than that they should exercise an adequate amount of self-control; but the best-directed moral treatment cannot enforce this if the patient do not himself (or herself) coöperate. Much may be effected, however, as in the education of children, by presenting adequate *motives* to self-control; and the more frequently this is exerted, the more easy does the

* "Principles of Mental Physiology," London, 1874, p. 663.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exertion become. This form of insanity is particularly common among females of naturally 'quick temper,' who, by not placing an habitual restraint upon themselves, gradually cease to retain any command over it. The writer well remembers that, when going with Dr. Conolly through one of the wards on the female side of the Lunatic Asylum at Hanwell, Dr. C. remarked to him: 'It is my belief that two-thirds of the women here have come to require restraint through the habitual indulgence of an originally bad temper.'"

And again :*

"There can be no doubt that many a man has been saved from an attack of insanity by the resolute determination of his will *not* to yield to his morbid tendencies. But if he should give way to these tendencies, and should dwell upon his morbid ideas, instead of endeavoring to escape from them, they come at last to acquire a complete mastery over him; and his will, his common-sense, and his moral sense at last succumb to their domination. . . . And so the judicious physician, in the treatment of an insane patient, whilst doing everything he can to invigorate the bodily health, to ward off sources of mental disturbance, and to divert the current of thought and feeling from a morbid into a healthful channel, will sedulously watch for every opportunity of fostering the power of self-control; will seek out the motives most likely to act upon the individual; will bring these into play upon every suitable occasion; will approve and reward its successful exercise; will sympathize with failure even when having recourse to the restraint which it has rendered necessary; will encourage every renewed exertion, and will thus give every aid he can to the reacquirement of that volitional direction which, as the bodily malady abates, is alone needed to prevent the recurrence of the disordered mental action."

That the insane are amenable to discipline every alienist knows. The whole system of management of our lunatic asylums is based upon this principle. The granting of indulgences for good conduct and the taking-away of privileges for infractions of the rules have an influence which many of the most violent of the insane distinctly feel and by which they are governed. Tell a lunatic who is in the habit of spreading his butter over the tablecloth that if he continues his disorderly conduct he shall have no more butter, and he will be very apt to desist. Whether his erroneous ideas should be combated by arguments addressed to his reason is a somewhat different matter. It has been said that it is useless to attempt to convince a lunatic that his erroneous notions are not true. Perhaps this is correct when serious structural lesions exist in the brain. The false intellectual conception is then a fixed result of the altered brain-tissue, and is just as direct a consequence of cerebral action as is a natural thought

*P. 673, *et seq*.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from a healthy brain. Still, we know that in health it is sometimes possible by argument to counteract the most firmly-rooted ideas; it is, perhaps, yet easier to do this by the aid of certain of the pleasurable emotions. And there appears to be no reason why the like result may not occasionally be produced by arguments addressed to a person with an insane mind, and by bringing into action those feelings which spring from kindness. We know, in fact, that this end is at times accomplished, and that by never for one instant admitting the truth of an insane delusion, and at suitable times—not obtrusively, but when occasion offers—urging such arguments against it as would be convincing to persons of sound minds, the lunatic comes at last to see the falsity of his ideas, and to laugh at them himself. Little by little he loses faith in his perverted reason, and, though he may take up another delusion, the last is held with much less tenacity than the first.

A great deal of the insanity of the day is, as I have said in the beginning of these remarks, the result of defective education, by which a smattering of knowledge in regard to many things is acquired, while no thing is thoroughly learned. A feeling of vanity, therefore, which is inherent in all mankind, is developed to an inordinate degree, and every child is taught to regard himself as somebody when in fact he is nobody. I cannot close these remarks more appositely than by citing a paragraph from the Philadelphia *Times*, which appeared in a number of that paper during the summer of 1877, premising that what is said in regard to criminals is equally applicable to lunatics.

"What a terrible satire upon our boasted free-school system is conveyed in the word 'educated.' Nine-tenths of the young criminals sent to the penitentiary have enjoyed school advantages, but three-fourths of them have never learnt to do an honest stroke of work. Our children have their poor little brains crammed full of all kinds of impossible knowledge, of names and dates and numbers and unintelligible rules, till there is absolutely no room left to hold any of the simple truths of honor and duty and morality, which former generations deemed more important than all the learning of the books. There is just one thing that is ever held before them—that one man is as good as another, if not a little better, and that every boy among them may expect to become President of the United States, and every girl the richest lady in the land. The result is that they leave school utterly ignorant of all that is most essential for them to know. And, outside of the schools, there is no provision for their learning anything."

WILLIAM A. HAMMOND.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# A WORD ABOUT THE REAR-GUARD.

BY LIEUTENANT J. ROSE TROUP, OF THE REAR-GUARD.

"From time immemorial it has been the custom to regard the dead as free from censure and to bury their misdeeds with them in their graves. But it must be admitted that it is cruel and unjust to slander and vilify the living."—From report of Mr. Stanley's speech in New York, December 3, 1890.

IT IS in the belief that Americans, not less than the English, are fond of fair play that I place this article before the public in the United States, this being at present my only method of gaining their attention.

You have heard Mr. Stanley's account of the rear-guard of his expedition, and now I would ask you to give me a patient hearing while I lay before you as temperate and as clear a case as it is possible for one of the actors, or, perhaps I should say one of the accused, to state. I shall presume that you have some acquaintance with the various histories of the rear-guard which have been recently published, but, nevertheless, I wish to point out a few salient features.

Mr. Stanley gives his account in his book, "In Darkest Africa," and this he asserts is his official report. Bearing this fact in mind, notice that he makes no reference therein to the horrible charges that have since been made public. When he published those volumes, he knew all that he has since given to the world; yet he ignores in his official report the existence of charges of cruelty and brutality. Not only that, but he ascribes many virtues to those he has since condemned, at the same time blaming the others, against whom no such serious accusations have been brought. His change of base must be considered most carefully.

First, let us examine his statements contained in "In Darkest Africa" regarding Major Barttelot. Mark you, all these were made when he knew just as much as he now knows about the fearful charges against his subordinate. He says (vol. I., p. 6): "I possess positive proof that the Major and Mr. Jameson were

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

inspired by loyalty and burning with desire throughout those long months at Yambuya." After commenting on the Major's distinguished services (vol. I., p. 103) he adds: "If these facts were true, then undoubtedly he was the fittest officer for the office of commanding the rear column. Had there been a person of equal rank with him, I should certainly have delegated this charge to another, *not because of any known unfitness*, but because he was so eager to accompany the advance column." (The italics in the quotations from Mr. Stanley's book are mine.) On page 471 he writes: "Major Edmund Musgrave Barttelot, a generous, frank, and *chivalrous* young English officer"; and on the next page he adds: He "satisfies us all that in him we have a man of energy, resolution, and action, and that there is no need of anxiety respecting the conduct of the rear column. In every letter and report he is animated by the utmost loyalty and willing spirit." A little further on (p. 480) he says: "In the Major's official report, in Mr. Jameson's last sad letter, I discern a singleness of purpose, inflexible resolve, and the true fibre of loyalty, tireless energy, and faith, and a devotion which disdains all calculation of cost."

Turning over the leaves of his book, we can find nothing against Major Barttelot's character except where he is criticised for "irresolution" and failure to march out from Yambuya; a condemnation which is laid upon all the officers alike. Added to this we have Mr. Stanley's letter to Sir Walter Barttelot (dated April, 1890), in which he writes:

"I do not wonder the Major got more and more vexed, and became more and more harassed. According to his light he could rightly plead that he was doing *what he thought right*." "It is not likely that you will forget what your son's nature was any more than we will the impression he made upon us. Ardent, impetuous, outspoken, prompt as tinder to utter the thoughtless word, but generous, brave, and the beau ideal of a jockey of Mars, —fit to have ridden that fatal race into the flames of Muscovy's cannon side by side with the boldest of the Light Brigade, or to lead a forlorn hope to bid men stand when all would fly,—Major Barttelot will ever be remembered by us." "I greatly regret that I can do no more than assert my perfect belief that *every thought* that animated your son was for the well-being and success of the enterprise for which he had volunteered; and I do not think there is one man out of ten thousand living who, after resolving to discover what persuasion could effect with Tippu Tib, would have done otherwise than persevere in the attempt; and none possessing the zeal and ardor and passion for work that distinguished your son could possibly have evaded the fate which overtook him. However erring the conception of his

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

duty, his companions concurred in it, and he, being the responsible chief, suffered while performing what he and they considered to be his duty, . . . and I only regret that I could not have been twenty-eight days earlier, to have rescued a young fellow *whose heart I shall always believe was in the right place.* If anything in the above lines jars on your parental feelings, I pray you attribute it to the facts.* I would wish they were otherwise, but whatever they may be, as I loved your son, and admired him for many excellent qualities befitting a brave and *noble* soldier, I hope you will accept the sincere expression of sympathy for his untimely loss."

In these quotations we have nothing but praise, and, in fact, no published utterances of Mr. Stanley's previous to the appearance of Major Barttelot's diaries contain any mention of brutal characteristics—nothing but laudation of his loyalty and devotion, with many excuses for any errors of judgment made by the impetuous, noble British officer. With all this staring us in the face, —as statements made by Mr. Stanley in his official report, which *should have contained the truth, the whole truth, and nothing* but the truth,—what can we do but conclude that he disbelieved the tales that had reached his ears concerning Major Barttelot's conduct? Otherwise he must now wish us to understand that his original statements regarding the Major's characteristics were inaccurate, for it is impossible to reconcile his present accusations with his former judgment, made, as he says, with full knowledge of the facts.

The world was put in possession of Mr. Stanley's opinion, and there the matter rested from July until the gag of silence was removed from the mouths of the other officers of the expedition in October. At that time appeared "Major Barttelot's Diaries and Letters," edited by his brother. Now, this volume contained some very serious charges advanced by Captain Barttelot on the strength of statements contained in his brother's diaries and on facts that had come to his knowledge. Among the accusations that he brings against Mr. Stanley we may note the following: that he deliberately left the weakest men with the rear column; that he failed to supply either white or black men with proper food; that he made some underhand agreement with Tippu Tib, placing the rear column completely at the mercy of the wily Arab; that he deliberately broke his promise to return to Yambuya, though he makes himself out as a faithful keeper of all promises, and de-

* He doubtless refers to his criticism of Major Barttelot in another part of the letter, where he blames him for not marching out, for believing and trusting Tippu Tib, etc., etc.



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mands similar conduct from every one under him; that he did not use every effort to communicate with his rear-guard; that he knowingly placed them in an extremely dangerous position; that a portion of the ammunition left with them he knew to be utterly worthless; that he deserted the rear column; that he left them and their stores as a bait to entice the Arabs from his own path; and, above all, Mr. Stanley himself being fully responsible for the disasters to the rear column, that he, in order to shield himself from blame and to have nothing to detract from his own glory, throws all the responsibility upon Major Barttelot and his companions, and with monstrous malignity and ingratitude charges those who served him faithfully with "irresolution," "neglect of promises," and "indifference to written orders." This is the substance of the terrible indictment brought by Captain Barttelot, with page after page of evidence to support his statements and uphold his theories. No one can read the book without being startled by the carefully-reasoned arguments and convincing proofs leading only to one conclusion.

Yet when this is placed before Mr. Stanley, and the charges are publicly commented upon, what does he do? Does he deny the truth of Captain Barttelot's statements or of his arguments? Does he bring forward anything to prove their inaccuracy? Does he assert that Captain Barttelot's evidence and witnesses are not worthy of credence? Does he do any single thing that an ordinary man would feel bound to do in order to prove to the public that he is guiltless of all these terrible charges? Does he appreciate that some of them, such as deliberately planning the ruin of the rear-guard and actually deserting it, would force a jury to convict him of manslaughter, *if they were uncontradicted*? Does he take any steps to clear himself from accusations that affect his reputation so seriously? No indeed! He does nothing of the kind. He simply keeps silence on all these points, and, *as if it were a justification of himself*, he turns around and retorts, in substance: "See what a brute Major Barttelot was, and see what a villain Mr. Jameson was!" He holds up his hands in horror and details a long list of crimes that he has officially ignored. He gives to the public a sickening tale of shameful brutality and of deliberate murder. When asked at the outset, "What evidence have you to support this?" he replies: "A sixteen-page letter written by Mr. Troup." This was said on the eve of his departure to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

America. On his arrival there he is confronted with the publication of that very sixteen-page letter, which contained no reference to the awful charges he had made, the only criticism of the Major being in regard to the food supply of the blacks.

We can hardly help imagining that Mr. Stanley was completely taken aback when he found this ground cut from beneath his feet. Under these circumstances he changes his base and asserts: "My authority was Mr. Bonny, whose diary I possess." He had already told me that my diary was *not* evidence; yet he made terrible accusations on the authority of Mr. Bonny's diary. He admits that he has the statements of only one white man, Mr. Bonny; yet with a grand air, when Mr. Bonny publishes a signed statement, he triumphantly calls attention to the fact that "Mr. Bonny's statement confirms all I have said"! One cannot help exclaiming: "Naturally enough! You tell a tale founded on assertions made to you by Mr. Bonny, and then Mr. Bonny repeats his original statements. You speak as if Mr. Bonny had a dual personality—one that asserts and another that confirms its own assertion!"

But let us examine for a moment the evidence produced to support these serious charges. Read carefully what Mr. Bonny says in his published statements that appeared in *The Times* on November 10 and 15, 1890, and the log, a large part of which is written by him, November 17, 18, and 19. I will not go into all these here, only touching upon those with which my name has been associated. Two of the events referred to by Mr. Bonny happened while I was still connected with the expedition, viz., the shooting of a Soudanese soldier and the flogging of John Henry. As I have pointed out elsewhere, Mr. Bonny's version of the story misrepresents the cause of the shooting of the Soudanese, and he never credits me with having voted against it. As regards the flogging of John Henry, I was not present when it took place. Mr. Bonny was, and he is the only living witness; but it should be added that he it was, on his own confession, who desired that flogging should be substituted for shooting. Mr. Bonny describes a third occurrence, the stabbing of Ngungu, and asserts that "Lieutenant Troup can testify to the truth of this statement." On the contrary, I can do no such thing. My only information regarding the reputed stabbing was derived from Mr. Bonny himself, who told me a similar tale to that now published; but as

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Ngungu continued to visit our camp on most friendly terms and showed no signs of any such wound as Mr. Bonny describes, I can say nothing in support of this charge.

It will, therefore, be apparent that my testimony would not bear out in every detail the stories told by Mr. Bonny concerning the only events of which I had any cognizance. The other statements regarding cruelty rest almost entirely upon Mr. Bonny's evidence, though supported in some cases by the gossip of black men, and in others directly contradicted by them. Not only does he record these acts of barbarity, but he was the only person present. If, in Mr. Stanley's eyes, it is a matter for condemnation for any one to have allowed another to "go on kicking, striking, slaying, stabbing, and biting human beings," Mr. Bonny, and Mr. Bonny alone, is the person to be condemned, for neither Mr. Ward nor I was present during all these scenes. It should also be noted that Mr. Stanley does not indorse the conclusion arrived at by Mr. Bonny that Major Barttelot was insane.

Let us look at the tale about Mr. Jameson. The chief point urged against him is that he deliberately purchased the girl with the object of having her slain. The only personal evidence produced by Mr. Bonny to support this is that Mr. Jameson told him "the whole thing and made no disguise of it" (*Times*, November 14, 1890); yet even he does not actually state that Mr. Jameson said he intentionally bought the girl in order to see her eaten. Mr. Jameson's entry in his own diary, written before any charges had been made against him, does not support the view that he was aware that the handkerchiefs given actually bought the slave; but it rather indicates that he had no deliberate intention of being instrumental in causing her death. Had he acted with "malice aforethought," he would hardly have told a frank story such as Mr. Bonny has repeated. The statement that Mr. Jameson really bought the girl for the purpose of seeing her sacrificed rests, therefore, on the evidence of Assad Farran, the only witness who was with Mr. Jameson. I ask you as fair-minded men what reliance can be placed on Assad Farran's statements. He spread the report throughout the Congo Free State, but when he reached London he "declared most solemnly" before witnesses that it was entirely untrue and that he was animated by ill feelings against Mr. Jameson; a fact that is borne out by the latter's diary. Mr. Stanley also asserted on his arrival at Zanzibar that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the stories were false and incredible. Two years and more after the event Assad Farran saw Mr. Stanley at Cairo, and at the latter's instigation wrote out an extraordinary "affidavit," containing numerous details that I can prove to be absolutely and entirely false. I doubt if any one who has carefully considered the circumstances of the case will accept the words of a deliberate perjurer in support of a serious accusation against a dead man.

To suggest that there was any crime in simply witnessing such a sight is to condemn Mr. Stanley and hundreds of other explorers and scientific men, who have seen and described scenes equally horrible. To suggest that Mr. Jameson should have tried to prevent the occurrence of such an event is really absurd; the woman would have been killed, in all probability, just the same, and Mr. Jameson's life would have been sacrificed to no purpose. How could he have rushed forward on the impulse of the moment when, by his own account, he seems to have been paralyzed by the horror of the scene that took place in such an instant of time? Mr. Stanley, who has exaggerated every item to the utmost, asserts that I am a witness that Mr. Jameson was guilty of deliberately causing the murder of the girl, and founds this upon my reply to his query that I saw the sketches. The simple fact that the sketches existed is no evidence whatsoever. If it were, there would be wholesale hanging of sensational war correspondents, medical students, scientific men, and explorers, including Mr. Stanley, who would suffer more severely than any one else. No, I am far more ready to believe the word of an honest English gentleman, like Mr. Jameson, than the statements of a perjurer like Assad Farran, or the lying tales collected from the scum of the black men by Mr. Stanley's own colored valet, who was not within a thousand miles of the scene when it took place. Let us believe that the thoughtful, sympathetic Mr. Jameson was not deliberately guilty of the crime laid to his charge, until some more conclusive proof is forthcoming.

Mr. Stanley has used my name in this instance and on other occasions in an unwarrantable manner. In fact, I think it is only right that I should in this place touch in passing upon the accusations with which he has associated my name. His most serious reflection is that I was largely responsible for the failure of the rear-guard, because the whole affair might have succeeded *if I had simply tied up Major Barttelot and sent him in an open*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

*canoe down the river*. When I pointed out to him that such conduct would have been mutiny against my superior officer and disloyalty to himself, for Major Barttelot was his representative at that time, he calmly asserts, "Mr. Troup was afraid of being shot as a mutineer," insinuating that I was cowardly in my conduct.*

Mr. Stanley in his recent lecture† has done his best to bring up sins of omission and commission on my part. But, after all, what do these personal matters really amount to? He says that I *demanded* £150, and that I skulked in my hut. Now, listen to the facts, and see how he deliberately misrepresents me. I never *demanded* any sum or outfit. If I had been demanding payment, with my knowledge and experience in Africa I would have insisted upon receiving at least £500 a year. The amount mentioned in my contract was placed there by Sir F. de Winton before anything was said about remuneration. When he saw me opening my eyes in surprise at the figures, he apologized, saying he knew that was *nothing* for my services, but the truth was this was a philanthropic expedition, and they could not pay more; but he would mention that there would be also a bonus—a commission on Emin's ivory—paid to each of the officers. I made no remark on this. The outfit was given to the other officers, and the fact of the matter is I never received the articles specified in my contract.

From these facts it may be seen how he has gone out of his way to misrepresent the matter. Why the desire for fame and glory allowed to the others should be denied me is puzzling, or even why I went because I had nothing better to do: did not all the others have nothing *better* to do, and was it not a compliment to the undertaking to consider it the best thing to accomplish? As regards my being in my hut, Mr. Stanley has reiterated his statement that I was there because of a quarrel with Major Barttelot, deliberately wording his insinuation so as to make it appear that this was the only cause that made me remain in my hut. He knows, on the contrary,

* He even points out that I could easily have overcome any resistance, as I was a heavier man than the Major. In connection with this I may here mention that after reaching England from Africa, having had a river trip and a long sea voyage to aid in building me up, I weighed only 120 pounds—much less than any of his advance column, who are supposed to have suffered severely. When I left Yambuya, my weight could scarcely have exceeded 100 pounds, while my normal weight is 150 pounds.

† New York, December 3, 1890.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that I was seriously ill—so ill that I could not lift hand or foot; so that I was unable to pen a written remonstrance when he says I should have done so, for I could not move even out of bed, much less out of my hut. In support of this I have the medical testimony of the certificate given by his own friend, Mr. Bonny, as well as the repeated statement of Major Barttelot that "Troup is dying," and a similar remark contained in Mr. Jameson's letters; and, if necessary, I can produce other witnesses who can testify to my condition. Yet Mr. Stanley again goes out of his way to say that I was simply skulking in my hut, while in reality I was lying helpless. Such is the magnanimous recognition of my services by the man for whose sake I sacrificed my health!

He also declares that I acted unworthily as a *subordinate.* His only suggestion of proof is that I failed to mutiny against my *superior* officer. I have mentioned this before, but I should like to ask him if he would by choice place a mutinous person in command. If not, then his charge that I was an unworthy subordinate falls to the ground. He brings nothing more serious personally against me, though, by some occult reasoning, he still maintains that I, with the others, wrecked the rear column by grave dereliction of duty.

To return to the accusations that have been brought against Mr. Stanley. Let us look for a moment at the evidence given by himself and his officers concerning some of these accusations.

*It has been said that he left the worst of the men with the rear-guard.* In proof of this we have his own words on page 103 of his first volume and on page 13 of his second, besides other incidental references. We have also the evidence of the diaries of Major Barttelot and Mr. Jameson and the statements of Mr. Ward and myself. As against this we have a vague denial reported to have been made by Mr. Stanley. Therefore it is not unreasonable to assume that this accusation has been proved against him.

*He says we had plenty of food, and also stores wherewith to buy more.* The details of the exceedingly small supply of European provisions have been treated of elsewhere. There were hardly forty small tins of edibles per officer to last the whole time of the expedition after reaching Yambuya. Mr. Stanley had locked these up more effectually than if he had turned a key on them, by his open accusation that the officers, including those of the ad-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vance column, had tampered with them on their way up the river. No one after that would touch a box unnecessarily, and certainly would not help himself to its contents. From his own list of other provisions left with the rear-guard we learn that there were altogether forty-six loads of rice and biscuits. Allowing that the contents of these equalled on an average fifty pounds,* there were then just 2,300 pounds. This, it must be allowed, was a very small quantity to divide among two hundred men. As it was, this was the mainstay of the officers, and, allowing a ration of one pound per diem to each of the five officers, it would have lasted just about fifteen months—a month longer than Mr. Stanley was absent. It must, however, be remembered that a large portion of this food was totally unfit to eat; a fact of which Mr. Stanley is not ignorant. The manioc, the food for our men, Mr. Stanley writes, was poisonous, because it was not carefully prepared—*the* cause, he says, of the mortality in our camp; at least so he writes in his book, but he has since declared that there were other causes of a horrible nature.

It has been suggested that we might have started plantations of our own, but though this was possible, it should be borne in mind that for the first five months we hoped every day we might leave our camp with Tippu Tib's assistance, and after that time, while still hoping for that, we also daily expected that Mr. Stanley would fulfil his promise and return to take us back with him to Wadelai. In this state of uncertainty, with the probability of a speedy move, it would have been a waste of time and energy to work plantations that might never be of use to us; and also we should have been obliged to detail a number of men from our already small force to guard the plantations day and night.

As to the allegations made by Mr. Stanley that the stores left at Yambuya were for the purpose of buying food for our men (see report of interview), nothing could be more false. In his written instructions he lays down, as the most important thing, the preservation of these stores, which were "the currency needed for transit through the regions beyond the lakes." The loss of them "would be certain ruin to us, and the advance force would need to solicit relief in its turn." If we had used these

*A full load is sixty pounds, but the weight of the cases and leakage from sacks must be deducted; so fifty pounds is a fair allowance.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

for purchasing supplies, it would have been in direct disobedience to his orders.

*He now declares there were two cases of medicine left for the rear-guard.* If this is a fact, why did he omit to mention it in the full list of stores given at the end of his first volume of "In Darkest Africa"? No reference is there made to medicines of any kind, and I again assert that we suffered seriously for the lack of proper medicinal supplies, and Mr. Bonny's medical certificate indorses my statement. I can only surmise that, if there was medicine in camp, it was among our leader's private stores, and for touching these he has reviled us.

So much in proof of the accuracy of some of the charges of dereliction of duty made against Mr. Stanley, proving, too, that he has seriously *misrepresented facts*—to call the matter by the mildest epithet.

Now let us see what he brings against the officers of the rear-guard as a body.

"*Irresolution of the officers.*" What proof has he? and if true, what was the cause thereof? He has not pointed out very clearly what we were irresolute about, but, as far as can be gathered, he refers to our having accepted the promises of Tippu Tib and relied upon him. Let us ask, Who told us to trust him? Mr. Stanley. And who was it said he would accept the word of Tippu Tib rather than that of a white man? Mr. Stanley again.

"*Neglect of promises.*" Leaving aside his own neglect of his promise to return in November, the only promises of which we have any cognizance are those contained in our contracts. We agreed to serve him loyally and devotedly, to obey his orders, and use our utmost endeavor to bring the expedition to a successful issue. Would we have been carrying out such promises if we had marched out of Yambuya at a time when we each felt that by so doing we should not be using our best endeavors toward the success of the expedition, and should be disobeying his most explicit order to guard the stores? We acted according to our lights, and we felt convinced that, if we marched without any aid from Tippu Tib, we should only lose our men and stores in the forest, and would thus bring ruin upon the expedition.

"*Indifference to written orders.*" In connection with this Mr. Stanley has charged Mr. Ward and myself with twisting those orders ingeniously to suit our own views. Therefore I

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

can only leave it to the public to peruse those instructions and discover, *if possible,* the construction Mr. Stanley places upon them, viz., that we should have marched without any assistance whatsoever from Tippu Tib. I assert and maintain that in those instructions or orders—for in reading his book one is exasperated by his contradictory words as to whether these were "suggestions," "advices," or "orders"—he makes no provision whatsoever for the possibility of Tippu Tib's failure to supply us with any men. He distinctly says, "Although Tippu Tib sends *some* men," in which case we were to make marches of six miles twice over. The impossibility of even such a task has been proved by the evidence not only of the surviving officers, but of the experiences of the column when it did march. If with such assistance as they then had it was impossible to keep the loads intact, how much harder would it have been to guard the stores when they were to be carried by two hundred invalids marching back and forth through the bush! It is not worth while to go into the subject of the injustice of Mr. Stanley's expectation that we, with half the number of men he had, should succeed in transporting nearly seven hundred loads through a country where his four hundred picked men with light loads nearly failed. I have proved that injustice beyond contradiction already.

I have pointed out in my book very clearly how impossible it was to march, arguing the matter fully, supporting my statement by figures and other evidence. I have also given proofs of Mr. Stanley's failure to supply us properly with food and medicine. I have supported these, too, by uncontroverted facts. Yet he ignores all these charges and this evidence just as he does that of Captain Barttelot. He sets himself up as above criticism, and then from his pedestal looks down to condemn all the officers of the rear column, charging us indiscriminately with causing or countenancing acts of brutality or cruelty.

When Sir R. N. Fowler and the Aborigines Society condemn Mr. Stanley's actions in Africa, why does he not adopt his former line of defence, if such it can be called? He does not reply to the condemnation at all, but simply says, "See what brutes the rear-guard officers were," and adds, in his own words: "I was told that some of them caused a great deal of trouble by ill treating African women. I was told, also, that some of Major Barttelot's officers made victims of the African women, and that there

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had been wild scenes and riotous revellings after the native fashion." Just as if this species of innuendo against other people, made without any authority given and without specifying the guilty parties, cleared him from such terrible charges as have been made against him.

Bear in mind that the full story of the advance column has never been told. All that has been placed before the public concerning events in the dark forest is put in the most attractive form by Mr. Stanley himself; but enough has been published to convince us that his march to reach Emin was not accomplished without sacrificing the lives of Zanzibaris, Soudanese, and natives. For this bloody track across the continent, which will close this district for a long time to more peaceful explorers, he has yet to account. He has scarcely done anything to justify himself for having marched, gun in hand, to rescue one who did not wish to be rescued.

As regards the rear-guard, Mr. Stanley has now at last admitted that he erred in placing Major Barttelot in command, and he has also admitted that he knew from the outset the character of that gentleman. There is one thing more we must ask him: that is, whether his conscience is perfectly clear when he reflects that he placed the lives of four white officers and two hundred black men in such imminent peril as he knew he would place them in if he left as their commander such a person as *Mr. Stanley now asserts he believed* Major Barttelot to be. Not for a moment do I admit the accuracy of all his charges against the Major, but on Mr. Stanley's own confession we learn that Major Barttelot was not the man to be placed in authority amid such difficulties as Mr. Stanley allowed to surround him.

Mr. Stanley has spoken of me as having accused him of different things; but I would call the attention of the public to the fact that I have only dealt with matters that he has brought against me. When he publicly asserted that I was responsible for certain acts and events, it became my duty to bring forward evidence to prove that the responsibility for these did not rest upon me, but upon him. The truth of the matter is that I have only made his accusations recoil upon his own head.

I had no desire to enter into any controversy with my late chief, but it became necessary for me to do so in order to defend my reputation from his unjust attacks upon it.

J. Rose Troup.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# HAVE WE A NATIONAL LITERATURE?

BY WALT WHITMAN.

So YOU want an essay about American National Literature, (tremendous and fearful subject!) do you? Well, if you will let me put down some melanged cogitations regarding the matter, hap-hazard, and from my own points of view, I will try. Horace Greeley wrote a book named "Hints toward Reforms," and the title-line was considered the best part of all. In the present case I will give a few thoughts and suggestions, of good and ambitious intent enough anyhow—first reiterating the question right out plainly: American National Literature—is there distinctively any such thing, or can there ever be? First to me comes an almost indescribably august form, the People, with varied typical shapes and attitudes—then the divine mirror, Literature.

As things are, probably no more puzzling question ever offered itself than (going back to old Nile for a trope), What bread-seeds of printed mentality shall we cast upon America's waters, to grow and return after many days? Is there for the future authorship of the United States any better way than submission to the teeming facts, events, activities, and importations already vital through and beneath them all? I have often pondered it, and felt myself disposed to let it go at that. Indeed, are not those facts and activities and importations potent and certain to fulfil themselves all through our Commonwealth, irrespective of any attempt from individual guidance? But allowing all, and even at that, a good part of the matter being honest discussion, examination, and earnest personal presentation, we may even for sanitary exercise and contact plunge boldly into the spread of the many waves and cross-tides, as follows. Or, to change the figure, I will present my varied collation (what is our Country itself but an infinitely vast and varied collation?) in the hope that the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

show itself indicates a duty getting more and more incumbent every day.

In general, civilization's totality or real representative National Literature formates itself (like language, or "the weather") not from two or three influences, however important, nor from any learned syllabus, or criticism, or what ought to be, nor from any minds or advice of toploftical quarters—and indeed not at all from the influences and ways ostensibly supposed (though they too are adopted, after a sort) — but slowly, slowly, curiously, from many more and more, deeper mixings and siftings (especially in America) and generations and years and races, and what largely appears to be chance—but is not chance at all. First of all, for future National Literature in America, New England (the specially moral and schoolmaster region, as a cynical fellow I know calls it) and the three or four great Atlantic-coast cities, highly as they to-day suppose they dominate the whole, will have to haul in their horns. *Ensemble* is the tap-root of National Literature. America is become already a huge world of peoples, rounded and orbic climates, idiocrasies, and geographies—forty-four Nations curiously and irresistibly blent and aggregated in ONE NATION, with one imperial language, and one unitary set of social and legal standards over all—and (I predict) a yet to be National Literature. (In my mind this last, if it ever comes, is to prove grander and more important for the Commonwealth than its politics and material wealth and trade, vast and indispensable as those are.)

Think a moment what must, beyond peradventure, be the real permanent sub-bases, or lack of them. Books profoundly considered show a great nation more than anything else—more than their laws or manners. (This is, of course, probably the deep-down meaning of that well-buried but ever-vital platitude, Let me sing a people's songs, and I don't care who makes their laws.) Books too reflect humanity *en masse*, and surely show them splendidly, or the reverse, and prove or celebrate their prevalent traits (these last the main things). Homer grew out of and has held the ages, and holds to-day, by the universal admiration for personal prowess, courage, rankness, *amour propre*, leadership, inherent in the whole human race. Shakespeare concentrates the brilliancy of the centuries of feudalism on the proud personalities they produced, and paints the amorous passion. The books of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Bible stand for the final superiority of devout emotions over the rest, and of religious adoration, and of ultimate absolute justice, more powerful than haughtiest kings or millionnaires or majorities.

What the United States are working out and establishing needs imperatively the connivance of something subtler than ballots and legislators. The Goethean theory and lesson (if I may briefly state it so) of the exclusive sufficiency of artistic, scientific, literary equipment to the character, irrespective of any strong claims of the political ties of nation, state, or city, could have answered under the conventionality and pettiness of Weimar, or the Germany, or even Europe, of those times; but it will not do for America to-day at all. We have not only to exploit our own theory above any that has preceded us, but we have entirely different, and deeper-rooted, and infinitely broader themes.

When I have had a chance to see and observe a sufficient crowd of American boys or maturer youths or well-grown men, all the States, as in my experiences in the Secession War among the soldiers, or west, east, north, or south, or my wanderings and loiterings through cities (especially New York and in Washington), I have invariably found coming to the front three prevailing personal traits, to be named here for brevity's sake under the heads Good-Nature, Decorum, and Intelligence. (I make Good-Nature first, as it deserves to be—it is a splendid resultant of all the rest, like health or fine weather.) Essentially these lead the inherent list of the high average personal born and bred qualities of the young fellows everywhere through the United States, as any sharp observer can find out for himself. Surely these make the vertebral stock of superbest and noblest nations! May the destinies show it so forthcoming. I mainly confide the whole future of our Commonwealth to the fact of these three bases. Need I say I demand the same in the elements and spirit and fruitage of National Literature?

Another, perhaps a born root or branch, comes under the words *Noblesse Oblige*, even for a national rule or motto. My opinion is that this foregoing phrase, and its spirit, should influence and permeate official America and its representatives in Congress, the Executive Departments, the Presidency, and the individual States—should be one of their chiefest mottoes, and be carried out practically. (I got the idea from my dear friend the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

democratic Englishwoman, Mrs. Anne Gilchrist, now dead. "The beautiful words *Noblesse Oblige*," said she to me once, "are not best for some developed gentleman or lord, but some rich and developed nation—and especially for your America.")

Then another and very grave point (for this discussion is deep, deep,—not for trifles, or pretty seemings). I am not sure but the established and old (and superb and profound and, one may say, needed as old) conception of Deity as mainly of moral constituency (goodness, purity, sinlessness, etc.) has been undermined by nineteenth-century ideas and science. What does this immense and almost abnormal development of Philanthropy mean among the moderns? One doubts if there ever will come a day when the moral laws and moral standards will be supplanted as over all: while time proceeds (I find it so myself) they will probably be intrenched deeper and expanded wider. Then the scientific and democratic and truly philosophic and poetic quality of modernism demands a Deific identity and scope superior to all limitations, and essentially including just as well the so-called evil and crime and criminals—all the malformations, the defective and abortions of the universe.

Sometimes the bulk of the common people (who are far more 'cute than the critics suppose) relish a well-hidden allusion or hint carelessly dropt, faintly indicated, and left to be disinterred or not. Some of the very old ballads have delicious morsels of this kind. Greek Aristophanes and Pindar must have abounded in them. (I sometimes fancy the old Hellenic audiences must have been as generally keen and knowing as any of their poets.) Shakespeare is full of them. Tennyson has them. It is always a capital compliment from author to reader, and worthy the peering brains of America. The mere smartness of the common folks, however, does not need encouraging, but qualities more solid and opportune.

What are now deepest wanted in the States as roots for their literature are Patriotism, Nationality, Ensemble, or the ideas of these, and the uncompromising genesis and saturation of these. Not the mere bawling and braggadocio of them, but the radical emotion-facts, the fervor and perennial fructifying spirit at fountain-head. And at the risk of being misunderstood I should dwell on and repeat that a great imaginative *literatus* for America can

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

never be merely good and moral in the conventional method. Puritanism and what radiates from it must always be mentioned by me with respect; then I should say, for this vast and varied Commonwealth, geographically and artistically, the puritanical standards are constipated, narrow, and non-philosophic.

In the main I adhere to my positions in "Democratic Vistas," and especially to my summing-up of American literature as far as to-day is concerned. In Scientism, the Medical Profession, Practical Inventions, and Journalism, the United States have pressed forward to the glorious front rank of advanced civilized lands, as also in the popular dissemination of printed matter (of a superficial nature perhaps, but that is an indispensable preparatory stage), and have gone in common education, so-called, far beyond any other land or age. Yet the high-pitched taunt of Margaret Fuller, forty years ago, still sounds in the air: "It does not follow, because the United States print and read more books, magazines, and newspapers than all the rest of the world, that they really have therefore a literature." For perhaps it is not alone the free schools and newspapers, nor railroads and factories, nor all the iron, cotton, wheat, pork, and petroleum, nor the gold and silver, nor the surplus of a hundred or several hundred millions, nor the Fourteenth and Fifteenth Amendments, nor the last national census, that can put this Commonweal high or highest on the cosmical scale of history. Something else is indispensable. All that record is lofty, but there is a loftier.

The great current points are perhaps simple, after all: first, that the highest developments of the New World and Democracy, and probably the best society of the civilized world all over, are to be only reached and spinally nourished (in my notion) by a new evolutionary sense and treatment; and, secondly, that the evolution-principle, which is the greatest law through nature, and of course in these States, has now reached us markedly for and in our literature.

In other writings I have tried to show how vital to any aspiring Nationality must ever be its autochthonic song, and how for a really great people there can be no complete and glorious Name, short of emerging out of and even raised on such born expression, coming from its own soil and soul, its area, spread, idiosyncrasies, and (like showers of rain, originally rising impalpably, distilled from land and sea) duly returning there

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

again. Nor do I forget what we all owe to our ancestry; though perhaps we are apt to forgive and bear too much for that alone.

One part of the national American literatus's task is (and it is not an easy one) to treat the old hereditaments, legends, poems, theologies, and even customs, with fitting respect and toleration, and at the same time clearly understand and justify, and be devoted to and exploit our own day, its diffused light, freedom, responsibilities, with all it necessitates, and that our New-World circumstances and stages of development demand and make proper. For American literature we want mighty authors, *not* even Carlyle- and Heine-like, born and brought up in (and more or less essentially partaking and giving out) that vast abnormal ward or hysterical sick-chamber which in many respects Europe, with all its glories, would seem to be. The greatest feature in current poetry (in literature anyhow) is the almost total lack of first-class power, and simple, natural health, flourishing and produced at first hand, and typifying our own era. Modern verse generally lacks quite altogether the modern, and is oftener possessed in spirit with the past and feudal, dressed may-be in late fashions. For novels and plays often the plots and surfaces are contemporary—but the spirit, even the fun, is morbid and effete.

There is an essential difference between the Old and New. The poems of Asia and Europe are rooted in the long past. They celebrate man and his intellections and relativenesses as they have been. But America, in as high a strain as ever, is to sing them all as they are and are to be. (I know, of course, that the past is probably a main factor in what we are and know and must be.) At present the States are absorbed in business, money-making, politics, agriculture, the development of mines, intercommunications, and other material attents—which all shove forward and appear at their height—as, consistently with modern civilization, they must be and should be. Then even these are but the inevitable precedents and providers for home-born, transcendent, democratic literature—to be shown in superior, more heroic, more spiritual, more emotional, personalities and songs. A national literature is, of course, in one sense, a great mirror or reflector. There must be something before—something to reflect. I should say now, since the Secession War, there has been, and to-day unquestionably exists, that something.



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Certainly, anyhow, the United States do not so far utter poetry, first-rate literature, or any of the so-called arts, to any lofty admiration or advantage—are not dominated or penetrated from actual inherence or plain bent to the said poetry and arts. Other work, other needs, current inventions, productions, have occupied and to-day mainly occupy them. They are very 'cute and imitative and proud—can't bear being left too glaringly away far behind the other high-class nations—and so we set up some home "poets," "artists," painters, musicians, *literati*, and so forth, all our own (thus claimed). The whole matter has gone on, and exists to-day, probably as it should have been, and should be; as, for the present, it must be. To all which we conclude, and repeat the terrible query: American National Literature—is there distinctively any such thing, or can there ever be?

WALT WHITMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# THE STRUGGLE IN CANADA.

BY ERASTUS WIMAN.

SIR JOHN MACDONALD, the prototype in North America of Disraeli, is, next to Mr. Blaine and Mr. Cleveland, the most marked political figure on the continent. He has more power over a wider area than the President of the United States, and he rules more absolutely than the Chancellor of the German Empire or the Premier of Great Britain. He is the embodiment of political astuteness; and this fact, with a knowledge that he represents, in a special and peculiar sense, the wishes and desires of the imperial power of Great Britain over the wide expanse of British possessions in North America, makes him to the people of the United States an intensely important personage.

Sir John becomes all the more important when it is recalled that his efforts, and those of the great Tory party that he alone controls, have been for years directed towards lessening the intercourse between the people that together hold this continent in common. What God has joined together Sir John and his party have been trying to put asunder. That two nations, speaking the same language, occupying a contiguous territory along a border-line unparalleled in length, and deeply imbedded in each other's domain, should desire to trade with each other seems most natural. But it has suited the purpose of Sir John and his party to shape the policy of the greater half of the continent in a direction precisely opposite to a friendly relation with the most active trading nation under the sun, and to separate himself and his people from a close connection with the greatest money-making, money-spending aggregation of humanity that the world has ever seen.

The effort thus put forth has had for its purpose, in an area comprising 40 per cent. of the British Empire, the setting-up of a fiscal system that should make it a country by itself, and create a great nationality, independent, isolated, and self-contained. This

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

attempt has all the more significance when it is made side by side with a nation whose growth of wealth, whose magnitude of internal commerce, whose progress and prosperity, are the wonder of the world. If it is true that "comparison is at the bottom of all philosophy," the task which Sir John has set for himself to perform, and to accomplish anything like success therein before the world, seems almost beyond human achievement.

Yet up to this time the effort has been courageously and most astutely made; and were it not for the fact that it is a war upon geography, a battle against nature, it might in the end succeed. But the forces which are arrayed against dividing this continent commercially in twain have been too numerous and too strong to make the attempt successful. The desire of the people of Canada, on the one hand, to trade with their brethren across the border, and the equal desire of the people of the United States, on the other, for enlarged markets and future supplies of raw material, have set in motion a commercial movement which all the political forces in the world cannot defeat. This movement has taken on the form known as Unrestricted Reciprocity, and is a movement which has assumed proportions so universal as to deserve the description of Goldwin Smith, that "its spread among the people has been like the light of the morning pervading the universe." Sir John, in a recent most important and passionate manifesto, has been good enough to attribute the origin of this movement, and its advocacy, to him who pens these lines. He says:

"The Liberal party has taken a new departure, and has announced its policy to be Unrestricted Reciprocity. That (as defined by its author, Mr. Wiman, in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW a few days ago) means free trade with the United States and a common tariff with the United States against the rest of the world."

Sir John has many honors, not only from Her Gracious Majesty, but from the people whom he rules and whom he serves, and he deserves them all. But not one of these rewards for high services can be more prized than that which he thus imparts in designating the undersigned as the originator of a scheme so comprehensive in its consequences, so beneficial in its operation, and so certain to become effective.

The growth of the desire for reciprocal relations between the two countries, originating only four years ago in a definite movement, has found its outcome in the terror which has struck the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Tory party. This terror finds expression in the dissolution of the Canadian Parliament a year in advance of its legal expiration. The dissolution is decided upon, not from any great public cause, to provide for no impending war, no financial disaster or other threatened casualty, but simply and solely to prevent another year of educational effort, conscious that, were it permitted, it would dispose of any claim that the Tory party had to any continuance of confidence. This unwarranted dissolution shows how well grounded is the claim that Sir John has more power over 40 per cent. of the British Empire than has the Premier of Great Britain over the whole of it. It may well be believed that Her Majesty, woman though she is, would never be guilty of using the great prerogatives of her crown to dissolve the British Parliament in order to perpetuate the power of a party, thus conspiring to defeat the wishes of her people. The Governor-General of Canada, who represents Her Majesty in her British possessions in North America, is, however, as putty in the hands of the astute manipulator that rules over these broad areas.

The dissolution of Parliament at this juncture, too, is in direct violation of the equities of the situation. The census is just due, and a reapportionment is in order. Besides this, the official lists of voters, under the direct pledge that no dissolution would occur were not revised last year, the consequence of which is that one hundred thousand young men are disfranchised. These lists having been revised only up to 1889, no young man less than twenty-three years of age can vote, because of the absence of his name from the list of voters. This vast array of thinking young men, independent and self-reliant, Sir John does not wish to exercise their judgment and independence. These, coupled with the enormous number of the rising generation who have left the Dominion for the United States in the last few years, comprise the most intelligent and the most desirable voters, from whom might be drawn large additions to the Liberal party. The policy which drives the young men from the country,—for the old men are not able to go,—and which with one stroke of the pen disfranchises a large proportion of those who remain, is in keeping with the trick which in midwinter, and on thirty days' notice, precipitates a conflict to decide a question of the most momentous importance as to the future policy of half a continent for half a century to come.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For the first time in the history of the Canadian nation the question is squarely presented as to what are to be hereafter the relations between it and the great aggregation of commonwealths that lie at its border. It is difficult to imagine any subject of more vital importance than the relations to be maintained between two such countries. Stretching side by side for almost four thousand miles; occupied by people of precisely the same language, having the same wants in natural products, and in every providential provision supplementing one another; possessing the essentials of each other's prosperity and progress, how strange does it seem, that within thirty days, with the most partial preparation, the vast question of their future commercial destiny shall be decided! Yet such appears to be the case. The two parties in Canada have at length been so placed in juxtaposition with each other as to make this question of relations between the United States and Canada the single point of issue.

The Tories have adopted what is known as the National Policy, the result of which is isolation and commercial belligerency. A high rate of duty against American manufactures; an antiquated and harsh interpretation of the fisheries treaty; a railway policy menacing American profit; a discrimination against American bottoms in Canadian waterways; a denial of bonding privileges for fish and grain, and a general policy of commercial hostility pervade the politics of the Tories. Loyalty to the British crown, and mock sentimentality as to treason and rebellion, are somehow mixed up with this apparent desire to get the better of the American people. The sentiment which animated the United Empire loyalists who left this country in the time of the Revolution, because they thought they could not live anywhere except under the British crown, permeates, to a very large extent, the Tory party. They are suspicious of a design to politically appropriate their country, and by some insidious movement extend the Republic so as to include all the British possessions in America. In these later days he is dubbed a traitor who wants to trade with his cousins across the border. Sir John Macdonald, in his recent manifesto, lashes himself into a passion of patriotic fervor by attributing to those who thus seek to trade freely designs upon the independence of Canada, and a desire to rob the British crown of its most precious jewel.

The first thought that strikes the average observer at this ac-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cusation is how fragile must be the character of the loyalty that could thus be seduced by trade and traffic. A people who are so vigorous in their denunciation of traitors, who are so unalterably pledged to British connection, who are so firm in their adherence to existing political conditions, ought to have nothing to fear from the closest contact by trade and commerce with an adjoining nation. It is a poor compliment to the free institutions of Canada, and to the strength of the attachment to British institutions which undoubtedly exists throughout the country, to think that the latter can be lessened by the most intimate trade relations with the United States. The shrieks of the loyal legions of the Tory party as to the possibility of annexation resulting from trade and commerce are most amusing, when contrasted with the relation which Great Britain herself bears to the United States. One would think that loyalty in Canada is an article so precious that it should be put in a glass case to be gazed at, rather than to be in every-day use; while loyalty in Great Britain consists in advancing the interests of the country by promoting, by every possible plan, the increase of commerce and building up the most intimate relation with the kin across the sea.

Hardly an hour goes by but in the great harbor of New York there sails up some stately ship bearing the British flag, manned by British sailors, loaded down with British goods, and which shortly returns again loaded with American products for British consumption. So closely connected and so intimate are America and Great Britain that no two nations under the sun trade so greatly with each other. Every week in the year, two millions of dollars of interest is earned on English money in the United States, to be contributed to the incomes of England. At the present rate of procedure, Great Britain will in the next half-century own half the industrial enterprises of the United States; and it would not be surprising to see eventually a million dollars a day of interest remitted to Great Britain. Notwithstanding the fact that the United States have constructed 40 per cent. of all the railways in the world, it is safe to say that fully one-third of the money invested in these roads belongs to Great Britain. There is no disloyalty in this kind of trade, and because of it there is no desire apparent on the part of the United States to change the political conditions which pervade England.

True, so far as Canada is concerned, there is a general idea

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the United States that its destiny might be that of assimilation into the Union which now binds together the great constellation of commonwealths that make up the United States. But this is a vague and inconsequent conception, which will hardly in the lifetime of this generation assume the shape of practical politics. There is a complete absence of the slightest desire on the part of the American people to capture Canada by any military prowess, to purchase her by any expenditure of money, or to shape her destiny by any legislation except that which is of a character entirely promotive of commerce. This seems hardly the case with the McKinley Bill, which appeared aimed at the Canadian Dominion, because its agricultural schedule, so severely drastic in its effects, applied only to a near-by agricultural country. But the terms of this tariff are not more severe against Canada than against the tin-plate industries of Wales, the cotton industries of Manchester, the wines of France, or the woollen and fancy-goods interests of Germany. If there were any design on the part of the United States to change the political character of the nations with whom they trade by the enactment of this tariff, it is not visible to the naked eye. As a matter of fact, the political conditions of Canada were no more in mind in the making of this change in the fiscal system than were the future political conditions of the Fiji Islanders.

But, in spite of this indifference, Sir John does not hesitate to say that the tariff was influenced by parties in the interest of reciprocal trade. He would have his constituents believe it was enforced in order to put a sort of a thumb-screw upon Canadian loyalty, to enable Americans to see how far it would yield under the adverse conditions resulting from this apparent display of hostility by this country. He forgets to mention the fact that, anterior to the McKinley Bill, the tariff of Canada, known as the Foster tariff, was most unjust to the United States, and that articles which had been on the free list, such as fruit, shrubs, seeds, and other natural products, were made to bear a heavy duty, notwithstanding a statutory offer of freedom between the two countries originally made by Canada. Indeed, the whole policy of the Tory party has been one of hostility and reprisal, and Sir John himself is the author of an expression, which has a logical sequence, that "if it was impossible to obtain a reciprocity in trade, they could secure a reciprocity in tariffs." A reciprocity of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tariffs has come with a vengeance, so far as the Canadian people are concerned; first in the Foster tariff against American manufactures entering Canada, and then in the McKinley tariff against Canadian products entering the United States. Some idea of the kind of reciprocity in tariffs that Sir John sought for is found in such charges for entrance into the United States as a duty of five cents a dozen on eggs, twenty-five cents a bushel on potatoes, twenty-five cents a bushel on apples, $4 a ton on hay, and $30 each on horses, down to the charge on any little pig that is driven across the border of $1.50 as the price of its admission into this free land.

The conflict that impends in Canada is whether these conditions of isolation and of commercial hostility shall continue to prevail. The Liberal party of Canada approach the electors with the single plank in their platform of Unrestricted Reciprocity with the United States. This means, so far as Canada is concerned, an abolishment of the severe and harsh measures of the McKinley Bill, of which the items just cited are a sample. It equally means a complete obliteration of the customs line that now shuts out American manufactures from half a continent, a region whose possibilities are to be measured only by the commerce created in its southern half. The advantages flowing to Canada from such a freedom and participation in such a commerce are simply enormous. The consequences that will flow from cheapened supplies of American manufactures and an open market in the United States are almost beyond present conception. This is the prospect which the Liberals offer. On the other hand, the Tory party ask for a continuance of power to perpetuate the policy that has begotten the strained relations between the two peoples and a number of most serious complications—a policy which has resulted in an enormous exodus from the Dominion, greatly reduced values of agricultural lands, and produced a serious condition of finance, extremely burdensome, from which the Canadians will have great difficulty in extricating themselves. It would be singular, indeed, if, with two such proposals before them, there is not a decision favorable to the Liberal party and better relations between the two countries.

The boon which the United States can grant to Canada is greater than that which any country under the sun can offer to a near-by nation. Every government in Europe, including Great

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Britain, would accept the offer of Unrestricted Reciprocity with an alacrity that would almost take one's breath away. Yet, so strangely involved is the question in Canada, so brief is the period for decision, so sharp has been the action of the astute politician who at present governs that vast area, that it will not be surprising, the issue being confused by proposals of Partial Reciprocity, if an adverse verdict is returned. Three times have the Liberal party been defeated on questions of far less import than that which now is presented to the Canadian people. If a fourth time they should fail to elect the majority in Parliament, on the square issue of better relations with the United States, there may well be some apprehension as to the future.

But it is impossible that two great nations, side by side with each other, having so many interests in common, and whose destiny and future are so closely interwoven, can long remain commercially hostile to each other. It may be that a continuance and prolonged dose of McKinleyism are necessary for the education of the Canadian people. It is just possible that the high duty which the Foster tariff enforces in Canada is essential to proper education. These results will all follow the defeat of the Liberal party. The fact that Sir John urges reciprocity in natural products, and tries to delude the farmers of Canada into the belief that a partial reciprocity is possible, shows how desperate is the need of the Tory party. Every one acquainted with the question knows how utterly impossible is a partial reciprocity, so far as the United States are concerned. An enlarged market for manufactures is the essential basis of the new movement for reciprocity. If manufactures are omitted, there is no ground to seek an extension into new markets; and it has been aptly said that "one might just as well attempt to build a railway to the moon as to get reciprocity from the United States with the omission of the manufactured interests." It shows how desperate are the straits to which the Tory party have been driven when they undertake to obtain what they know cannot be got, and run the risk of the disaster which will certainly follow their utter failure in the future.

Of course the free admission of American manufactures into Canada and the continuance of a duty upon English goods, as proposed by the Liberals, mean a discrimination against Great Britain. The possibility of 40 per cent. of the British Empire taxing the manufactures of the other 60 per cent., and admitting

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

those of a hated commercial rival free, is a circumstance of great significance and of very far-reaching importance. It is this which makes the movement in Canada appear disloyal to the mother-country. True, the Tory party has set the example, under the freedom which Great Britain nominally gives to her colonies to regulate their fiscal affairs by the necessities of their own condition. Thus, under Tory rule, Canada discriminates against British goods in favor of her own manufactures. It is pushing this liberty only to its legitimate result in the proposal of the Liberal party to admit American manufactures free of duty, in return for a free admission into the United States of Canadian products in payment for the same.

At this writing, of course, no one can tell the result of the contest now impending in Canada. The suddenness of the dissolution, the unpreparedness of the Liberal party for the contest, the unfavorable season for voters to get to the polls, are all adverse circumstances. Against this, however, is the educational process which has been going on for the last four years, and the fact that the personal and individual interests of a greater number of persons are more adversely affected in Canada by present political conditions than is the case in any other country at the present moment. This especially applies to the great class of farmers, lumbermen, fishermen, miners, and shippers, together forming the vast majority of the people of the Dominion. These men, if they vote as their interests point, will decide the question, and the victory will be overwhelmingly in favor of Unrestricted Reciprocity. At the present moment it looks as if this would be the case, and thus duplicate the political upheaval that took place in the United States in November last.

If the Tory party, however, should succeed in the election, which will now be decided within a few days, it can only be for a brief period, for already the seeds of disintegration are sown. Three or four years of such object-lessons as the McKinley Bill enforces on one side of the border, and the Canadian tariff reënacts on the other side will have their legitimate outcome. The forces thus at work towards a better relation are irresistible; and if the Liberal party are defeated at this time, the next election, which is likely to be very early in the history of the country, will tell a different tale. Great bodies move slowly; great movements take a long time to accomplish the results with which they are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pregnant; and it will not be surprising if the attempt to heal the great schism of the Anglo-Saxon race, by the assimilative results of intimate trade relations, is for a time postponed by Tory tendencies. These tendencies, but for the independence of this people, would have held this vast continent in leading-strings a hundred years ago, retarding a progress, a development, and a growth in wealth more beneficial to mankind at large than any other event in the history of the world. That Canada, occupying as she does the greater half of the continent, has a future in store for her equally great is as certain as the sun. The fulfilment of her destiny may be for the moment deferred, but cannot be defeated.

ERASTUS WIMAN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# WHY HOME RULE IS UNDESIRABLE.

BY W. E. H. LECKY, AUTHOR OF A "HISTORY OF ENGLAND IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY."

---

SINCE the memorable occasion when Mr. Gladstone, having just gone to the country at a general election without the smallest intimation that he had changed his opinions or intentions on the question of Irish home rule, and having actually appealed to the electors to send in such a Liberal majority as would make him independent of the Parnellites, announced his conversion to the party whose votes had become essential to his majority, and attempted to place the government of Ireland in their hands, there has been no transformation scene in English politics comparable in its dramatic interest to that which has taken place since the verdict in the divorce case in which Mr. Parnell was the respondent.

The former event, as is well known, led to the most serious disruption of the Liberal party that has taken place since 1793. A minority of that party, comprising—if Mr. Gladstone himself be put aside—by far the greater part of the weighty leaders, both of its moderate and of its advanced section, broke away from the main body. Among these "dissentient Liberals" were the Duke of Argyll, Mr. Bright, Mr. Chamberlain, Lord Cowper, Lord Derby, Mr. Goschen, Lord Hartington, Sir Henry James, Lord Northbrook, and Lord Selborne, and it is no exaggeration to say that they carried with them the overwhelming majority of the more educated portion of the party in England, as well as nearly every Protestant Liberal in Ireland. All these strenuously maintained that in the existing condition of Ireland home rule would be merely another word for investing the National League with legislative powers; that it would inevitably place the government of Ireland in the hands of men who could not be trusted to discharge the most elementary functions of honest government; that it must reduce Ireland to a condition of utter anarchy, and that it would probably strike a fatal blow to the security of the empire.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The attempt to carry a home-rule bill, tearing the whole constitution of the empire in pieces, through a newly-elected Parliament, without the smallest authority from the constituencies, was defeated, and the question was speedily submitted to the country at an election. Mr. Gladstone had the advantage of carrying with him the organizations of the Liberal party, which was naturally the strongest party in the kingdom. He himself enjoyed a far greater personal ascendency than any other living English statesman. He was supported by the solid Irish Catholic vote in all the great English towns; and the eighty-six Parnellite members, who had hitherto been bitterly opposed to him, and who had invariably shown themselves either ostentatiously indifferent or ostentatiously hostile to the general interests of the empire, were now the most obsequious of his followers. But in spite of these advantages he was utterly defeated.

In the Parliament which had been elected at the close of 1885, and which met in January, 1886, there had been 333 Liberals, 251 Conservatives, and 86 Parnellites. In the Parliament which was elected in July, 1886, the Gladstonian Liberals had sunk to 205. The Parnellites remained 86, while the Conservatives were 303 and the Liberal Unionists 75. The combined forces of the Gladstonians and the Parnellites were confronted by a clear working majority which exceeded 110, and an alliance was established between the Conservatives and the Liberal Unionists which has proved one of the most successful and has certainly been one of the most disinterested in English history. Mr. Goschen, it is true, at the desire or with the full consent of his colleagues, afterward consented, in a time of great difficulty, to place his rare financial abilities at the service of the government, and became Chancellor of the Exchequer, but the other members of the party decided to remain entirely without office; sinking their special differences with the Conservatives in the great and transcendent end of maintaining the unity of the empire, but at the same time giving a marked and steady liberal bias to the policy of the Conservative ministry.

Nearly five years have passed since the election, and no efforts have been spared by the defeated party to recover their position. Never, indeed, did an English party show such alacrity in burning what they had adored and adoring what they had burned; and there was a melancholy amusement in watching

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

how every characteristic step of their policy was best condemned by their own earlier words. The men who were now their closest allies, the men into whose hands they desired to place the protection of property, the maintenance of law, and the government of an integral portion of the empire, were the very men whom Mr. Gladstone had denounced and imprisoned as "preaching in Ireland the doctrine of public plunder"; pursuing a policy of "sheer rapine"; aiming at the "ruin of all who decline to obey the doctrine of the Land League"; "marching through rapine to the dismemberment of the empire." Boycotting, which Mr. Gladstone had shortly before denounced as "combined intimidation exercised for the purpose of inflicting ruin and driving men to do what they do not want to do," and with murder for its ultimate sanction, was now described as mere "exclusive dealing"—something like the conduct of a Tory lady who confines her custom to tradesmen of her own party. A Crimes Act which was exclusively directed against crime or against conduct clearly provocative of crime, which was called for by the most urgent necessity, and has been justified by the most beneficial results, and which in its leading provisions is considerably less stringent than Mr. Gladstone's own Crimes Act of 1882, was represented as a monstrous invasion of the liberties of the subject; while language was used about the Irish judges and the Irish constabulary which plain men who judged words by their obvious drift and tendency could only ascribe to a deliberate intention to discredit the administration of justice in order to render the task of governing Ireland as difficult as possible.

Obstruction was not formally supported by the Gladstonian leaders, but they were accustomed to leave the House of Commons while their allies, supported by Mr. Labouchère and other prominent Radicals, pursued it with such persistence that, without being able to inflict a single defeat on the government, they succeeded in impeding all important legislation during the session which took place in the first half of 1890. At the same time all the arts of the demagogue were sedulously and unscrupuously employed to sow division in the United Kingdom. "The masses" were skilfully opposed to "the classes," and were made the objects of the most fulsome flattery. Old, smouldering jealousies between Wales and England and between Scotland and England were industriously fanned. The abolition of the Welsh Estab-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lished Church and the abolition of the Scotch Established Church were held up as prizes to the Welsh and Scotch Nonconformists if they would send in a sufficient number of home-rule members into Parliament. Every fad and crotchet was encouraged by vague, deceptive, and mischievous language, which at once raised wild hopes, stimulated agitation, and yet left the speaker substantially unpledged.

At the same time a veil of studied vagueness was thrown over the intended scheme of home rule. The bill of 1886 had been literally riddled by hostile criticism, but it was now supposed to be withdrawn, and therefore a large portion of detailed criticism fell to the ground. One amazing portion of Mr. Gladstone's scheme had been that the Irish should be absolutely unrepresented in the Imperial Parliament and totally without a voice in imperial concerns, but that they should at the same time be bound to pay a tribute which was calculated at rather more than three millions of pounds to the imperial government. Was it conceivable, it it was asked, that a parliament of Ireland, even if it had been composed of men who were far more disposed to observe contracts than those who were likely to be brought together in a home-rule Parliament, would permanently accept this position? Was it not certain that one of its first measures would be, with the full support of its constituents, to refuse its tribute as a badge of slavery? And would not the exclusion of Irish representation from the Imperial Parliament be a first step towards the severance of Ireland from the empire? Mr. Gladstone had defended this exclusion on the ground that the presence in the Imperial Parliament of Irish members to vote on imperial questions was impracticable, as it was beyond the wit of man to distinguish accurately affairs which were imperial from those which are not. He now, however, declared himself quite ready to solve the difficulty and to admit Irish members into the Parliament at Westminster, though to what extent and in what manner and on what conditions was carefully concealed. Two different orders of members elected on different principles and with different qualifications were intended to vote together in the same Irish chamber, but the absurdities of such a system were so clearly shown that it was speedily dropped.

A more important measure was a bill which was intended to come into operation concurrently with the home-rule bill for the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

purpose of buying out Irish landlords by a large sum lent on imperial credit. Considering the attitude of the home-rule party towards landed property, such a measure was dictated by the plainest considerations of justice as well as policy; but it was a strange comment upon the schemes of Mr. Gladstone that such a measure was required in order to prevent the proposed legislature from commencing its legislative career by a wholesale plunder of settled, established, legal property. It was not, however, a popular thing to lend a vast sum on imperial credit to a country which Mr. Gladstone's legislation was making a foreign country and was bringing, as most experienced men thought, very near to separation; and accordingly, although Mr. Gladstone, Lord Spencer, and Mr. Morley had used strong language about some such policy being an obligation of honor towards the landed gentry of Ireland, it speedily dropped out of the Gladstonian programme, and its authors used all their powers to discredit the purchase measures of their successors. What Mr. Gladstone's real intentions on this matter were is difficult to say. He took care to inform the constituencies that he no longer considered himself bound by his Purchase Bill. If we may trust the recent revelations by Mr. Parnell of the conversations at Hawarden, Mr. Gladstone's final decision was, in the event of his obtaining a majority, to introduce a bill somewhat similar to that of 1886, but at the same time to put no pressure on his followers to carry it. In this way his conscience might be satisfied, without the smallest danger of the measure becoming law. It was a design which was truly characteristic of its author.

It was constantly urged by the Unionist members that Mr. Gladstone, when calling on the constituencies to return a home-rule majority, was at least bound to give some clear statement of the manner in which he intended to deal with these great questions. Mr. Gladstone and his colleagues, however, refused to comply, and there can be no doubt that their reticence greatly assisted them. It was impossible to argue against the details of an unknown scheme; it was difficult to prove the impracticability of a policy which was but half-disclosed; and under the shadow of a convenient obscurity many divergent opinions could be combined. The partisans of simple robbery who would place the land of the country without restriction in the hands of the authors of the "no-rent manifesto" and of the "plan of campaign" were en-



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

couraged by knowing that the Land-Purchase Act was abandoned, and that Mr. Gladstone was doing everything in his power to obstruct the policy of purchase which was adopted by his successors, while many moderate men succeeded in persuading themselves that some limited scheme could be struck out which would prevent home rule from being a mere plan of plunder and a civil war. Lord Rosebery had a political future before him, and was certainly not a fanatic. Lord Spencer had pledged himself very strongly to deal honestly with Irish landlords, and his character carried with it some, though greatly diminished, weight. Mr. Morley had used language of the same kind, and, however violent might be his opinions, there was at least a well-founded confidence in his sincerity and honor.

All these circumstances operated in favor of the Gladstonian party, and the question whether and how far they were gaining ground is a very difficult one. One prediction which was very confidently made in 1886 has been signally falsified. It was said that Liberal Unionism as a separate body would prove impossible; that the ties and attractions of old party connection, the disadvantages attaching to a comparatively isolated position in Parliament and in the constituencies, and the notorious difficulty of maintaining a close alliance between two originally discordant parties, one of them with and the other without office, would together bring about a speedy dissolution or disintegration of the Unionist alliance. This prediction, at least, has hitherto proved wholly erroneous. No alliance in English history has worked with a more perfect, a more uniform, a more unembarrassed harmony; and although the Liberal Unionists in Parliament have had their deserters, they have not been more than four or five.

With the educated classes also it may, I think, be safely affirmed that home rule has made no progress. No one who knows England will doubt that the overwhelming majority of educated Englishmen are fully convinced of its extreme danger, and of the extreme immorality of the means by which it has been advocated; and if the old middle-class constituencies had been unaltered, it would have been impossible. The true danger comes from other quarters. Vast masses of uninstructed electors had been brought into the constituencies by a recent reform bill. They, for the most part, knew little and cared little about the Irish question; they were told that every question in which they were interested

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

must be adjourned till home rule was carried, and the most powerful means had been taken to seduce them. Discouragement at past failures, simple weariness of the question, and the vain hope that it would be at an end if home rule were granted, might induce many to vote for unqualified concession, and among the most ignorant voters, who care little or nothing for political questions and parties, there is always a tendency to change votes so as to give each party its turn. In ordinary times such a tendency is scarcely an evil, but it becomes a great danger when one party has pledged itself to measures for the dismemberment of the empire.

It is undoubtedly true that the bye-elections since the last general election have, on the whole, gone against the government. The full strength of the case may be stated in a single sentence. The net result of the bye-elections has been a gain to the opposition of fifteen seats, counting thirty on a division; and this, with the addition of the small defection from the Liberal Unionists in Parliament, has reduced the government majority in the House of Commons to about eighty.

Prophecy has borne a very large part in the recent speeches of leaders of the Gladstonian party, and it has been their system to welcome every triumph at a bye-election in ecstatic strains, as if it were a national reversal of the verdict of 1886. Much, however, may be said to qualify this view. It is one of the most universal and best-recognized facts in English politics that it is the tendency of bye-elections to go against a government; and this was especially to be expected after such a gigantic and wholly abnormal displacement of political power as occurred in the election of 1886. Every government must offend large classes, commit mistakes, encounter difficulties, incur unpopularities; and at bye-elections personal, minor, and transient questions tell much more powerfully than in the enthusiasm of a general election. The loss of fifteen seats in four years and a half in a Parliament of 670 members was in no degree extraordinary; and even if the opposition were wholly homogeneous, a majority of eighty would still leave the government extremely powerful. Very few English governments since the Reform Bill of 1832 have been so unshaken after four and a half years of combat. Of the bye-elections several were demonstrably won by causes that were entirely unconnected with home rule; several were won by very small majorities, which would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

probably be destroyed at a general election; and the two strongest elements of attraction on the side of the opposition are essentially transitory. One is the amazing personal ascendency exercised over great classes of electors by a man of eighty-one. The other is the inestimable advantage of having no defined plan of home rule to defend. As soon as the opposition were compelled to bring forward a definite measure, differences were certain to arise, and the enormous difficulties of the question would be felt.

For what are the inherent difficulties of the problem to be encountered? In the first place, as I have lately reminded the readers of this REVIEW, it is desired to establish home rule in Ireland in opposition to the passionate resistance of a third of the population, that third comprising an overwhelming preponderance of the elements which in every healthy country would be the guiding influences of the nation. Almost the whole body of the Protestants, whether they be Episcopalians or Presbyterians or Methodists; nearly all the leaders and organizers of industry; the whole body of the Catholic landed gentry; the immense majority of men of all creeds who have risen to prominence in any lay profession; the bankers; the large shopkeepers and merchants; the directors of railways; the men who have created and chiefly worked the great linen manufacture, which is the principal manufacturing industry of Ireland; Belfast, which alone among Irish towns has risen to be a worthy competitor of the great centres of English industry; the counties in Ulster which in wealth, industry, and loyalty rank incomparably the foremost in Ireland,—all these great interests or sections of Irish life look on the rule of any parliament that could now be set up in Dublin as absolute ruin, as the greatest calamity that could befall them. On this side, too, are the vast and growing organization and the fierce, yet disciplined, passion of the Ulster Orangemen, who have pledged themselves to resist home rule to the very last, and who, if it were ever established, might once more play a most formidable part in Irish history.

A remarkable letter written by a fellow of Trinity College,* and published shortly after Mr. Gladstone announced his conversion to home rule, clearly shows the effect which that conversion at once had upon Irish credit. There was an immediate fall of all the more important securities. In three months the fall in

* The Rev. John Stubbs, D. D., March 15, 1886.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ten of what had always been deemed the most important and secure investment funds in Ireland amounted to no less than £4,111,500, or nearly 19½ per cent. If home rule were carried, it is perfectly certain that its first result would be a fatal shock to Irish credit and a great emigration of capital and industry; and it is no less certain that it must be accompanied or speedily followed by stringent coercive legislation for the subjection of Ulster. There would be the gravest danger of an armed resistance by the Orangemen, and at least of a general strike against taxation in the north, and British troops would soon be required to place the most loyal, industrious, and hitherto law-abiding population of Ireland under the rule of rebels and outside the protection of the Imperial Parliament.

And to whom would the guardianship of Irish government then pass? There can be no greater folly in politics than to set up a governing machine without considering into whose hands it would fall and in what spirit it would work; and there is no greater crime that a public man can commit than to place the government of a nation in the hands of dishonest and disloyal men. A long, patient, and most impartial judicial inquiry, conducted by some of the ablest judges in England, and supported by overwhelming evidence, has established beyond al reasonable doubt the character, aims, and methods of the men by whom the home-rule movement has been organized and directed, and who in a home-rule parliament would inevitably be the virtual rulers of Ireland. It has shown that at least eight of the most conspicuous leaders entered upon the movement for the express purpose of producing the complete severance of Ireland from the British Empire; and that the whole movement has been in the closest connection with a conspiracy which was not only animated by avowed and inveterate hatred of the British Empire, but was also directly responsible for those hideous dynamite outrages upon unoffending citizens which form one of the blackest pages in the history of the nineteenth century. "A true revolutionary movement in Ireland," Mr. Parnell once said, "should, in my opinion, partake both of a constitutional and an illegal character. It should be both an open and a secret organization, using the constitution for its own purposes, but also taking advantage of its secret combination." "While our objects lie far beyond what may be obtained by agitation," said a confiden-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tial circular of the Clan-na-Gael conspiracy, "a national parliament is an object which we are bound to obtain by any means offered. The achievement of a national parliament gives us a footing upon Irish soil; it gives us the agencies and instrumentalities of a government *de facto* at the very commencement of the Irish struggle. It places the government of the land in the hands of our friends and brothers. It removes the Castle's rings and gives us what we may well express as the plant of an armed revolution. From this stand-point the restoration of Parliament is part of our programme."*

This calculation is a perfectly just one. To any one who has any real knowledge of Irish history few things can be at once more grotesque and more audacious than the appeals which are sometimes made to the merits of the old Protestant and intensely loyal Parliament of the eighteenth century, which consisted mainly of the more important landlords of the country, as an argument for such a parliament as could now be set up. Is it conceivable that the integrity of the empire could subsist if all the vast powers which must necessarily reside in an Irish parliament were under the direction of old Fenian conspirators and of men who had been paid by the paymasters of murderers? If such a state of things could endure in times of peace and prosperity, could it last through the agonies of some great and perhaps disastrous European war, when the very existence of the empire was menaced, when all its resources were strained to the utmost? Is it not absolutely certain that differences must frequently arise between the two legislatures, and in what spirit would they be treated? For years it has been a main object of the present leaders of the home-rule party to stimulate among great sections of the Irish people a constant, unreasoning hatred of England and the English government, to teach them to regard every incident in foreign politics with favor exactly in proportion as it was likely to prove injurious to the interests of the empire. Can any reasonable man suppose that this spirit would at once cease? Even if the original agitators underwent some semi-miraculous process of political conversion, would not others inevitably arise to displace them by playing on the same popular passions? Any restrictions that were imposed on the local parliament would at once form a pretext for conflict; and what would be likely to happen if the

* Report of the special commission, 1888, pp. 18, 116, 117.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

parliament supported by the people pronounced those restrictions to be null and void, and if there were no means of enforcing them except a civil war ?

This is, however, by no means the full force of the case. It is one of the characteristic features of the present conspiracy that the leaders, having found it impossible to arouse the mass of the Irish farmers in a purely Fenian or national struggle, resolved to convert the movement into an agrarian struggle by making it one for the ruin and expulsion of the landlords of Ireland. The true and main motive of this movement was not agrarian, but political. It was desired to enlist in the movement a powerful class who had shown themselves half-hearted, and it was desired to ruin or expel another class who were the most powerful supporters of the Union and the connection. In the report of the special commission the evidence substantiating this charge has been arrayed with a fulness that leaves nothing to desire, and the history of this policy may be clearly traced to the writings of Lalor and Mitchel. It was favored by a period of keen agricultural depression, and it was supported by large American subscriptions.

One part of this campaign consisted in a skilfully-organized and widespread conspiracy to defraud creditors and repudiate contracts. Tenants were instructed to settle for themselves what rent they would pay, and, if that sum was refused, to lodge it with trustees who were to employ it in resisting the creditor. They were at the same time taught that rent was mere robbery ; that the prairie value of land at the utmost was all to which its owner was entitled ; that rents would be reduced again and again with each successive triumph of the home-rule party ; that the total abolition of the landlords of the country was the object to be aimed at, and that when it was attained the independence of Ireland would be won. The Pope has recently authoritatively condemned the "plan of campaign" as plainly immoral, and it is difficult to see how the most fervent Protestant can fail to agree with him.

Mr. Gladstone once declared that a body of men "have arisen in Ireland who are not ashamed to preach in Ireland the doctrines of public plunder"; and he added : "If you go forth upon a mission to demoralize a people by teaching them to make the property of their neighbors the object of their covetous desire, it does not require superhuman gifts to find a certain number of follow-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ers and adherents for a doctrine such as that." It was, however, clearly seen by the leaders of the movement that these measures would fail unless they were supported by a system of organized intimidation to prevent honest men from paying their debts and farmers from taking the vacant farms, and to bring ruin and every form of wretchedness on all persons who refused to obey the orders of the Land League. This system has been judicially pronounced by the special commissioners to be a "criminal conspiracy," and they have described it, in language which is certainly not beyond the truth, as an "elaborate and all-pervading tyranny." It has produced many murders, and countless outrages which are only a degree less horrible than murder. It pursues the poor man with a cold and calculated cruelty in every business of life, deprives him of the very necessaries of existence, follows him with the finger of scorn even into the house of God, drives the child out of the school, withholds medicines from the dying and sometimes coffins from the dead, mutilates hideously the harmless cattle that are browsing on an evicted farm, greets with jeers and ferocious merriment the widow and the orphans of the murdered man.

If the reader suspects that there is the smallest strain of exaggeration in this picture, he should examine the vast mass of sworn evidence which has been brought before the special commission, and he will then be able to understand the true character of a tyranny as barbarous and as elaborate as any that has been witnessed in modern days. If he will next turn to the sworn reports of the speeches of the leaders of the League, he will have little difficulty in concluding that all this mass of cruelty, tyranny, and fraud is the direct and inevitable consequence of their language and of their counsels. He will then, perhaps, understand the feeling with which respectable Irishmen look on those English politicians who have taken such men as their allies, and upon those American politicians who are accustomed to honor such men as "patriots."

I shall not pursue this subject further, nor can I attempt here to discuss fully the agrarian condition of Ireland and its bearing on the present agitation. The subject is one of great importance, but it would require an article to itself; and I have already, I fear, trespassed too much on the hospitality of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. I would only ask the American reader whether any serious and honest government could place the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

whole landed property of a country at the disposal of men holding these principles and pursuing this policy. I may here be permitted to repeat a few lines which I wrote on this subject in the beginning of 1886.

"Irrespectively of the enormous sums of English money that have been invested either in the proprietorship of Irish soil or in mortgages upon it, the obligation of honor as well as of interest which rests upon the English government is of the most overwhelming kind. There is, in the first place, the general duty of every government to protect property which has grown up under its rule. There is, in the next place, the notorious fact that a chief cause of the unpopularity of Irish landlords is their attachment to the English connection, and that the agrarian agitation is well known to have been begun by the Fenian or Separatist party, chiefly because without holding out some prospect of direct pecuniary advantage they could not enlist the farmers fully in their cause. There is, in the third place, the fact that about £52,000,000 has, in the lifetime of a single generation, been invested under the Encumbered-Estates Act in the purchase of Irish land, at the invitation of the government, and that all that land is held under a distinct Parliamentary title. There is, in the fourth place, the fact that Parliament has just established a new court for the express purpose of regulating the conditions of Irish property, and has exacted large sacrifices from the Irish landlords for what was supposed to be the general benefit of the country. If obligations of honor so strong, so clear, and so accumulated are neglected, no property held under the guarantee of the English government can be permanently secure."

A few words may here be inserted about the present position of Irish tenants—a subject which has, I believe, been scandalously misrepresented in America. The past agrarian history of Ireland undoubtedly contains many dark and shameful pages, though it can be easily proved that in the memory of living men the hardships which have been endured by Irish tenants have, in the enormous majority of cases, not been due to the oppression of any class or individuals in Ireland, but to the irresistible pressure of economical causes—to a great famine falling upon an immensely excessive population, and to the conversion of arable land into pasture, which, under the conditions of Irish soil and climate, was absolutely inevitable as soon as England opened her ports to foreign corn and American corn came into the market.

There were, however, undoubtedly defects in the law, especially in the matter of the protection of improvements made by tenants, and it is the great merit of the Land Act of 1870 that it very fully met this want. Since then, however, much additional legislation—some of it, in my opinion,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of very doubtful justice and expediency—has been carried in favor of the Irish agricultural tenant, and it is not too much to say that it has placed him in a position unique in the civilized globe. Although he may have contracted to hold his tenancy by the year or for a fixed number of years, he is now entitled to remain forever on his farm so long as he pays his rent and fulfils certain easy statutory obligations. His rent is fixed, not by contract or by market value, but by an independent judicial body. He has a right before and after eviction to sell the goodwill of his farm, for which he frequently obtains a larger sum than could be obtained for the freehold. He is entitled to full compensation for all permanent improvements; and a system of purchase has been carried, and is about to be largely extended, under which the government lends him the whole sum that is required to buy his farm, on such terms that, by paying for forty-nine years an annual sum which is considerably less than his actual judicial rent, he will become the owner of his tenancy. In this manner every tenant can, with the consent of his landlord, convert a judicial rent of £50 a year into a terminable payment to the government of £35 or £40.

These are only the leading provisions of a legislation to which I believe no adequate parallel can be found in the statute-books of any other country. It is perfectly true that the owner in Ireland, as in all other countries, can ultimately take possession of his property if the legal conditions under which it is held are persistently violated; but even this last right of eviction is restricted and guarded in Ireland in a manner which is wholly unknown in any other portion of the empire. Not only is the defaulting tenant credited with the value of his improvements and enabled to sell the good will of his farm. It is also provided that he cannot be evicted for non-payment of rent unless he is an entire year in arrear; and even then, if his rent is less than £100 a year, he has six months more given him during which he may redeem his tenancy. As a matter of fact, in the great majority of cases evictions only take place when the judicial rents have been several years in arrear and after large offers by the landlord have been made and refused; and it will be usually found that when in these cases there has been real distress, the chief burden has not been rent, but loans which have been raised at extravagant interest from local usurers and shopkeepers.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

I shall not venture to maintain that in the infinite variety of human circumstances absolutely no case of harsh eviction can even now take place in Ireland ; but it may be safely asserted that for one such case there are hundreds in London and in New York. In one respect, it is true, many of these Irish evicted tenants are deeply to be pitied, for many who are perfectly solvent have been most reluctantly compelled to give up their farms by the odious tyranny I have described. But it is not to beat down such a tyranny that subscriptions are asked for in America.

It is true, however, that in a large part of the west of Ireland great chronic poverty prevails. The soil there is chiefly rock or morass ; and the immense rainfall, which is the consequence of mountains bordering on a vast ocean, renders it impossible that it can ever be made agriculturally productive. In Scotland there is a large extent of land under the same conditions, but there the agricultural population has, for the most part, long since migrated to Canada or the United States, and the land is either turned into large sheep-walks or employed for sporting purposes, which at least bring into it much money and much profitable employment. Nothing of the kind exists or was ever contemplated in the west of Ireland, but there are tens of thousands of small cottiers holding portions of land too barren and too scant to support them in common decency through the year. They do not, however, depend solely on the land. Some are fishermen, but the furious swell of the unbroken Atlantic, the want of boats of sufficient magnitude to breast it, and the difficulty of finding a market for the fish have greatly restricted this industry. The kelp manufacture, which once largely assisted these poverty-stricken cottiers, has almost ceased, and their chief resource has long been the harvest work in England. Unhappily this, too, has failed them. Agricultural depression, the spread of pasture, and the spread of agricultural machinery in England have deprived them of a great portion of their scanty earnings.

All the best observers agree that in these parts of Ireland the question of rent is of little importance. The rents of these small cottiers are generally £4 a year or under ; they are very irregularly paid ; and even if they were wholly swept away, the situation of the population would not be materially improved. For this part of the Irish question it must be clear to every impartial

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

observer that the only radical cure is emigration, but to this the party of the agitators is bitterly opposed. Short of emigration, however, something may be done, and it has been one of the great merits of Mr. Balfour and the present government that they have grappled with the problem more resolutely than any of their predecessors. The light railways which are now being vigorously pushed on by the government in the poorest parts of Ireland, and the provisions for the encouragement of fisheries and agriculture which have been introduced—largely, I believe, at the suggestion of Mr. Tuke—into the Land-Purchase Bill now before Parliament, will do much to palliate, though they cannot wholly cure, the evil. The recent reception of Mr. Balfour in Donegal shows clearly that, in spite of calumny and agitation, the good work he is doing for these poor cottiers is clearly understood.

These remedial measures, however, as well as the system of land-purchase from which so much is to be expected, depend entirely upon the application to the development of Irish resources of the unrivalled credit of the empire. Of this inestimable benefit Ireland would be at once deprived by the triumph of home rule. Every man of business can estimate the probable credit of a government set up in violent opposition to the most industrious and prosperous portions of the nation, and conducted by professional agitators who have for years been making the systematic violation of contracts and the systematic defiance of law their engines of political propagandism. The pyramid of Irish credit is not likely to rise very high, if its foundations are laid in widespread fraudulent bankruptcy. It is quite true that there have been great revolutions in which appeals to cupidity and attacks upon property have borne a considerable part. In the great French Revolution these elements had a large, though never a dominant, place, but the results have not been encouraging, and M. Taine has recently shown, in an admirable volume, how it was only the long, stern despotism of Napoleon that restored the shattered credit of the nation. In the American Revolution also there was a party which advocated the repudiation of private debts as a means of political action; but in the American struggle such methods only bore a very small place, and it is to the eternal honor of John Adams that he most strenuously rebuked them.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But in the Irish home-rule movement attacks upon contract and debt, and appeals to the cupidity of large classes, have formed the very mainspring of the machine. The most constant boast, the most effective argument, of the leaders has been their success in breaking down contracts, ruining those who depended on them, reducing or abolishing rents. Is it credible that any sound economical or political edifice could be raised on such a basis? Are Irish landlords the only class with whom contracts can be made and broken? In any possible home-rule system the local parliament must be bound to England by contracts of the most vital character, relating to the defence of the empire and the contribution of Ireland to the national debt. What chance would there be in times of difficulty and danger of such contracts being observed if the administration of Ireland was in the hands of the authors of the "no-rent manifesto" and of "the plan of campaign," and if they had the spirit of Fenianism behind them? How can industry flourish, or capital increase, or prosperity spread, in a country where such a spirit is in the ascendant, and where the people are successfully taught to look upon politics chiefly as an instrument of plunder? What order, what liberty, can be expected in Ireland if the maintenance of law is intrusted to systematic law-breakers, and the security of individual freedom to the very men who invented and supported the tyranny of the Land League?

These considerations have long been urged by many who are very sensible of the profound differences between England and Ireland, and whose natural leanings are all in the direction of an extension of local government as far as such an extension is compatible with an honest and loyal administration of affairs. They believe, however, that no greater catastrophe could befall either Ireland or the empire than the triumph of the men who have been conducting this agitation; that no home-rule scheme such as Mr. Gladstone devised could possibly be a permanent settlement, and that it is difficult to exaggerate the evil which the agitation has already inflicted upon Ireland. Happily, the singular success of the present administration in restoring the ascendency of the law has done much to revive peace, confidence, and individual freedom in Ireland; and whatever may be the economical effect of the conversion of a great portion of the tenantry of Ireland into proprietors, it can scarcely

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fail to strengthen the Conservative elements of the country by greatly multiplying the number of those who are directly interested in the defence of private property. The process, however, must be a slow and difficult one, and the difficulty has been immensely aggravated by the fact that almost for the first time in English history there is an opposition in the House of Commons which can never be relied on to support the Queen's government in maintaining law and defending those who administer it, and which has completely discarded, on Irish questions, not only the old settled policy of the Liberal party, but also the principles and policy on which they had themselves acted within the present decade.

It is impossible, however, to deny that the whole aspect and prospects of home rule have been completely changed by very recent events. The undefended divorce case in last November, in which Mr. Parnell was a respondent, for the first time completely dispelled the illusions which the great body of the English Nonconformists appear to have formed about the character of that very remarkable man, who has for many years governed the home-rule movement with the most complete despotism, and upon whom its course in the immediate future seemed mainly to depend. There is probably no other country in Europe in which such an explosion of feeling as took place on this occasion could have been produced by such a cause. It was evidently perfectly genuine and spontaneous, and it sprang from the most respectable of sentiments; but it is not perhaps surprising that it should have greatly bewildered foreign nations, and that it should have inspired some cool observers at home with melancholy reflections about the kind of influences by which modern politics can be swayed.

When Mr. Gladstone, at the age of seventy-five, and after more than fifty years of active political life, suddenly announced the complete reversal of the policy about Ireland which had hitherto been uniformly pursued by his party and by himself, the great body of the English Nonconformists blindly followed him. They were unshaken by all the revelations of the special commission. They were prepared to place the government of their loyal fellow-countrymen in the hands of a man who had been convicted of treasonable conspiracy; of aggravated duplicity; of a course of conduct directly productive of perhaps as large an amount of fraud, tyranny, and outrage as any movement of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nineteenth century: it was only when he was proved guilty of a breach of the seventh commandment, which was totally unconnected with his public life, that the scales fell from their eyes, and they declared that they would abandon the home-rule cause if he remained at its head. The vehemence of the explosion was probably not anticipated by any class of politicians. When the divorce case was known to be pending, and only five days before it came to trial, Mr. Morley considered it a matter of so little political moment that he sounded Mr. Parnell about his willingness to accept the office of Chief Secretary of Ireland in a Gladstonian administration. The Irish members, on their side, disdainfully disregarded the Nonconformist protest. They unanimously reëlected Mr. Parnell their chairman; at a great and most enthusiastic meeting in Dublin, in which Mr. Justin McCarthy and Mr. Healy took a leading part, they announced their unbroken allegiance to him, and at the time when they took these decisive steps not a murmur of dissent was heard from the Irish bishops.

But meanwhile the Nonconformist protests were pouring in, and Mr. Gladstone was not blind to their significance. On the 24th of November he wrote the famous letter which broke up the home-rule party by insisting that Mr. Parnell should resign the leadership of the Irish party. The expressions of the letter were carefully weighed. There was a warm eulogy of Mr. Parnell's past career. The writer urged his request solely on the ground of political expediency, and not at all on the ground of public morals; and his words only implied, and were generally believed to point to, a mere temporary retirement until the inconvenient storm had passed. He had arrived, he said, "at a certain conclusion with regard to the continuance at the present moment of Mr. Parnell's leadership of the Irish party." "Notwithstanding the splendid services rendered by Mr. Parnell to the country, his continuance at the present moment in the leadership would be productive of consequences disastrous in the highest degree to the cause of Ireland." It would make Mr. Gladstone's own "retention of the leadership of the Liberal party . . . almost a nullity."

The sequel is well known. Mr. Parnell not only refused to retire, but at once appealed to that Fenian and anti-English sentiment which was supposed to be extinct. For years the Gladstonian politicians had been perpetually boasting of the "union

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of hearts" they had created, and constantly appealing both in public and in private to the "strong conservative instincts" of Mr. Parnell as the sheet-anchor of their cause, the best guarantee of the safe working of home rule. Few things in modern politics have been more amusing than the bewildered dismay with which they read the manifesto to the Irish people in which Mr. Parnell held them up as "the English wolves now howling for his destruction"; denounced the "insolent" attempt of an English party to assume a right of veto upon the Irish leadership; declared that it was no moral conviction, but simply the Parliamentary coercion exercised by the Irish party, that had "forced upon the English people the necessity of granting home rule to Ireland"; and assured the people, on the strength of a confidential conversation held by him with Mr. Gladstone, that the proposals and intentions of the English statesman were totally inadequate to solve the question that was pending between England and Ireland.

Mr. Parnell did not carry with him a majority of his colleagues. The bishops, after a silence of a fortnight, tardily discovered that it was contrary to public morality that they should follow a leader who had been in the divorce court; and the pent-up hatreds and jealousies in the home-rule party, which during Mr. Parnell's long autocracy had been prudently suppressed, flamed forth without restraint. In England the Gladstonian papers vied with each other in abusing Mr. Parnell as vehemently as they had praised him during the four preceding years, as vehemently as they had denounced him before the election of 1885; and his defeat in the County of Kilkenny showed the power of his adversaries. But, notwithstanding this, Mr. Parnell carried with him nearly thirty members of his party; he carried with him the central body of the National League in Dublin; he carried with him the strong popular feeling in the chief Catholic towns in Ireland, and in spite of Patrick Ford and Patrick Egan in America, and of Mr. Davitt in Ireland, he carried with him almost the whole strength of the Fenian sentiment of the country. It became evident in the Kilkenny election that the struggle which had begun was one between the power of the Fenians and the power of the priests; and the furious passions, the ungovernable hatreds, the total disregard for individual liberty, that at once appeared in the midst of a party which was in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

principle agreed, clearly showed what was likely to be the state of Ireland if all its discordant elements were unchained in the struggles of a democratic home rule. No man of common-sense who watched the scene could, at least, have the smallest doubt of the facility with which, in the event of any collision between an Irish parliament and an English government, the anti-English feeling in Ireland could be aroused. It is also worthy of notice that Mr. Parnell lost no time in making new appeals to the cupidity of the farmers, by holding out prospects of again breaking and reducing judicial rents if they would support him. This, indeed, has become the chief stock in trade of the Irish agitators.

But Mr. Parnell did more than divide the party. He also tore away the deceptive veil of vagueness which had been thrown over home rule. If, like all other men, he failed in extracting any unambiguous and straightforward statement from Mr. Gladstone, he at least succeeded in pledging both sections of the home-rule party to the minimum they would accept from the English government. It was now shown beyond dispute that the Home-Rule Bill of 1886 would have proved totally inadequate, and he obtained a pledge from all sections of the home-rule party in Ireland that they would accept no measure which did not give them the complete control of the constabulary and of the land of the country. The meaning of these two points is very clear. The first stipulation would place in the hands of an executive which would probably consist mainly of former Fenian conspirators, and of men who had been subsidized by the Clan-na-Gael society, an admirably-disciplined, semi-military force of about 13,000 men, and capable of an indefinite increase. It would give them the whole practical administration of the law, leaving it to them to decide how far and in what directions property should be protected and crime should be punished. It would also place the prospects of every man in a force whose loyalty and faithful discharge of difficult duties during the past years have been beyond all praise, at the mercy of men who had been pronounced by a recent judicial decision guilty of "a criminal conspiracy"; guilty of disseminating newspapers inciting not only to sedition, but to atrocious crime; guilty of themselves establishing "a system of intimidation and coercion" which led to crime and outrage, and "persisting in it with knowledge of its effect." The second stipulation was simply to place the whole land



PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the country at the disposal of men who had made (to repeat Mr. Gladstone's well-known phrase) the "advocacy of public plunder" their main instrument of political propagandism.

It is undoubtedly true—though not many years since it would have been deemed incredible—that English politicians will now be found ready to advocate these concessions, but I do not believe that any British Parliament will be induced to make them. The pressure of obvious self-interest will, no doubt, bring about some kind of reunion of the shattered home-rule party, and by the time these lines appear in print it is very likely to be accomplished. But it is not probable that the lessons of recent events will be forgotten, and they have profoundly altered the political prospect. Great numbers of very honest men had supported home rule through sentiment; through misplaced hero-worship; through party discipline; through ignorance of the true state of Ireland, or through the common error of judging politics by abstract principles and formulæ, without taking any pains to ascertain how in particular instances they were likely to work. Such men had no wish to rob any one or to oppress any one, and they imagined that an honest and orderly government could be established on a home-rule basis which would conciliate the Irish people and settle the Irish question. The events of the last months have gone far to undeceive them, and to show them the abyss toward which they were impelling both Ireland and the empire.

To another class the lesson of the election of 1886 and of the recent explosion has perhaps not been less salutary. A real check has been given to the gambling for a disloyal Irish vote which has of late years most seriously lowered the level of political morality in England. Many acute men have come to see that in resting on that vote they have been leaning on a broken reed; that there is an independent element of honesty and patriotism in the country which, if it is once fairly roused, will baffle all their calculations; and that it is quite possible for politicians to sacrifice their honor without serving their interests. Perhaps it is not only on one side of the Atlantic that such a lesson was required.

W. E. H. LECKY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

# NOTES AND COMMENTS.

## UNPUBLISHED LETTERS OF GENERAL SHERMAN.

THE following letters by General W. T. Sherman have not hitherto been published, and will have an unusual interest at the present time.

The first, written to General Garfield as to the loyalty of General Thomas, is, in its completeness, characteristic of the man. It gives a clear reason, too, for the apparent, not real, wavering of more than one man at the beginning of the Rebellion, when utter chaos stared every one in the face, and when, as under Buchanan, it seemed a question whether loyalty meant standing by the nation or standing by the State. Wavering ceased the moment a new President declared secession to be treason, and that the Union was to be fought for. Whatever Generals Grant, Sherman, and others may have thought of Thomas's proverbial *slowness*, his *loyalty* no man ever dared question in their presence.

HEADQ'R'S ARMIES OF THE U. S.,
WASHINGTON, D. C., Aug. 4, 1870.

*General* GARFIELD, *Hiram, O.*

DEAR GARFIELD: I have your letter of August 1, and will get General Whipple to make up a list of the officers who were with Thomas at Carlisle in 1860–61, and will enclose it with this, noting the address of those who are still living and are accessible. I attach great importance to whatever address you may deliver, because it will in time become *history*, and few men live who knew Thomas in his innermost character, to correct mistakes, if any. I have seen the letter published by Fitzhugh Lee, sustaining his assertion that at the outset of our civil war Thomas leaned to the South. I understand the state of his mind at that dreadful crisis, and see how a stranger might misconstrue him. At the time to which Fitzhugh Lee alludes the Buchanan administration was in power, and had admitted that the federal government could not coerce a sovereign State, and his cabinet did all they could to make army officers feel insecure in their offices.

The Northern politicians, as a rule, had been unfriendly to the army; and when the election of Lincoln and Hamlin was complete, they (the officers) naturally felt uneasy as to their future, and cast about for employment. Several of them, I among the number, were employed at the military colleges of the South, and it was natural that Thomas should look to his friend and (our) classmate Gilham, then employed at Frank Smith's military school at Lexington, Va. Thomas also entertained, as you must know, that intense mistrust of politicians to which the old army was bred, and feared the whole complication of 1860 would result in some political

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

compromise or settlement, if not in a mutual agreement to separate, in which case it is possible he would have been forced for a support to have cast his lot with the Southern part. It is more than probable that, at the mess-table at Carlisle, Thomas may have given vent to some such feelings and opinions, then natural and proper enough. But as soon as Mr. Lincoln was installed in office, and manifested the deep feeling of love for all parts of the country, deprecating civil war, but giving the keynote that the Union should be maintained even if it had to be fought for, and that forcible secession was treason, then all national men, Thomas among them, brushed away the subtleties of the hour, saw clearly his duty, and proclaimed it, not by *mere words*, but by riding in full uniform at the head of his regiment and brigade, *invading without a murmur his native State*, and commanding his men to put down forcible resistance by the musket. As you can recall the conflict of opinion which preceded the actual conflict of arms, I feel certain you can so paint it that not a shadow of suspicion will rest on his fair fame.

Yours, W. T. SHERMAN.

One of the historic scenes of the great war is described in the following letter of General Sherman. It is the meeting of Grant and Sherman with President Lincoln on board the "Ocean Queen" at City Point, just before the close of the war, and quite close to the tragic event that ended in the President's death. It is, possibly, the only council of the kind held during the whole war. Certain it is that at no other time during the contest did the distinguished commanders meet the President together.

It was from this interview that Sherman went to receive the surrender of Johnston's army, and it is now confidently believed that, had Lincoln lived to see the event, Sherman's first terms with Johnston would have been approved. Lincoln's wish was for perfect magnanimity towards the South—a magnanimity that has been practised by his successors in fact, even when the principles of Sherman and of Lincoln were in theory condemned.

WASHINGTON, D. C., November 28, 1872.
Thanksgiving Day.

*Hon.* J. N. ARNOLD, *Chicago, Ill.*

MY DEAR SIR: . . . We arrived [at City Point] during the afternoon of March 27 [1865], and I found General Grant and staff occupying a neat set of log huts on a bluff overlooking the James River. The General's family was with him. We had quite a long and friendly talk, when he remarked that the President, Mr. Lincoln, was near by, in a steamer lying at the dock, and he proposed that we should call at once. We did so, and found Mr. Lincoln on board the "Ocean Queen." We had met in the early part of the war, and he recognized me, and received me with a warmth of manner and expression that was most grateful. We then sat some time in the after-cabin, and Mr. Lincoln made many inquires about the events which attended the march from Savannah to Goldsboro, and seemed to enjoy the numerous stories about "our bummers," of which he had heard much.

When in lively conversation, his face brightened wonderfully, but if the conversation flagged, his face assumed a sad and sorrowful expression.

General Grant and I explained to him that my next move from Goldsboro would bring my army—increased to 80,000 men by Schofield's and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Terry's reënforcements—in close communication with General Grant's army, then investing Lee in Richmond, and that, unless Lee could effect his escape and make junction with Johnston in North Carolina, he would soon be shut up in Richmond, with no possibility of supply, and would have to surrender. Mr. Lincoln was extremely interested in this view of the case, and when we explained that Lee's only chance was to escape, join Johnston, and, being then between me in North Carolina and Grant in Virginia, he could choose which to fight. Mr. Lincoln seemed unusually impressed with this, but General Grant explained that at the very moment of our conversation General Sheridan was passing his cavalry across James River from the north to the south; that he would with this cavalry so extend his left below Petersburg as to reach the South Shore Road, and that, if Lee should "let go" his fortified lines, he, Grant, would follow him so close that he could not possibly fall on me alone in North Carolina. I, in like manner, expressed the fullest confidence that my army in N. Carolina was willing to cope with Lee and Johnston combined till Grant could come up, but we both agreed that one more bloody battle was likely to occur before the close of the war.

Mr. Lincoln repeatedly inquired as to General Schofield's ability in my absence, and seemed anxious that I should return to N. Carolina, and more than once exclaimed: "Must more blood be shed? Cannot this last bloody battle be avoided?" We explained that we had to presume that General Lee was a real general; that he must see that Johnston alone was no barrier to my progress; and that, if my army of 80,000 veterans should reach Burkesville, he in Richmond was lost, and that we were forced to believe he would not await that inevitable conclusion, but make one more desperate effort.

I think we were with Mr. Lincoln an hour or more, and then returned to General Grant's quarters, where Mrs. Grant had prepared for us some coffee or tea. During this meal Mrs. Grant inquired if we had seen Mrs. Lincoln. I answered, No; I did not know she was on board. "Now," said Mrs. Grant, "you are a pretty pair," etc., and went on to explain that we had been guilty of a piece of unpardonable rudeness. But the General said: "Never mind, we will repeat the visit to-morrow, and can then see Mrs. Lincoln."

The next morning a good many officers called to see me, among them Generals Meade and Ord, also Admiral Porter. The latter inquired as to the "Russia," in which I had come up from Morehead City, and explained that she was a "slow tub," and he would send me back in the steamer "Bat," Captain Barnes, U. S. Navy, because she was very fleet, and could make seventeen knots an hour, etc. Of course I did not object, and fixed that afternoon to start back.

Meantime we had to repeat our call on Mr. Lincoln on board the "Ocean Queen," then anchored out in the stream at some distance from the wharf. Admiral Porter went along, and we took a tug at the wharf, which conveyed us off to the "Ocean Queen." Mr. Lincoln met us all in the same hearty manner as on the previous occasion, and this time we did not forget Mrs. Lincoln. General Grant inquired for her, and the President explained that she was not well, but he stepped to the stateroom, and returned to us, asking us to excuse her. We all took seats in the after-cabin, and the conversation became general. I explained to Mr. Lincoln that Admiral Porter had given me the "Bat," a very fast vessel, to carry me back to Newbern, and that I was ready to start back then. It seemed to relieve him, as he

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was afraid that something might go wrong at Goldsboro in my absence. I had no such fears, and the most perfect confidence in General Schofield, and doubt not I said as much.

I ought not and must not attempt to recall the words of that consultation. Of course none of us then foresaw the tragic end of the principal figure of that group, so near at hand; and none of us saw the exact manner in which the war would close; but I know that I felt, and believe the others did, that the end of the war was near.

The imminent danger was that Lee, seeing the meshes closing surely around him, would not remain passive, but would make one more desperate effort, and General Grant was providing for it by getting General Sheridan's cavalry well to his left flank so as to watch the first symptoms, and to bring the rebel army to bay till the infantry could come up. Meantime I asked two weeks' delay and the "*statu quo*," when we would have our wagons loaded, and would start from Goldsboro for Burkesville *via* Raleigh. Though I cannot attempt to recall the words spoken by any one of the persons present on that occasion, I know we talked generally about what was to be done when Lee's and Johnston's armies were beaten and dispersed. On this point Mr. Lincoln was very full. He said that he had long thought of it; that he hoped the end could be reached without more bloodshed, but in any event he wanted us to get the deluded men of the rebel armies disarmed and back to their homes; that he contemplated no revenge, no harsh measures, but quite the contrary; and that their sufferings and hardships in the war would make them the more submissive to law.

I cannot say that Mr. Lincoln or anybody else used this language at the time, but I know I left his presence with the conviction that he had in his mind, or that his cabinet had, some plan of settlement ready for application the moment Lee and Johnston were defeated.

In Chicago about June or July of that year, when all the facts were fresh in my mind, I told them to George P. A. Healy, the artist, who was casting about for a subject for an historical painting, and he adopted this interview. Mr. Lincoln was then dead, but Healy had a portrait, which he himself had made at Springfield some five or six years before. With this portrait, some existing photographs, and the strong resemblance in form of Mr. Swett, of Chicago, to Mr. Lincoln he made the picture of Mr. Lincoln seen in this group. For General Grant, Admiral Porter, and myself he had actual sittings, and I am satisfied the four portraits in this group of Healy's are the best extant. The original picture, life-size, is, I believe, now in Chicago, the property of Mr. McCaig; but Healy afterwards, in Rome, painted ten smaller copies, about eighteen by twenty-four inches, one of which I now have, and it is now within view. I think the likeness of Mr. Lincoln by far the best of the many I have seen elsewhere, and those of General Grant, Admiral Porter, and myself equally good and faithful. I think Admiral Porter gave Healy a written description of our relative positions in that interview, also the dimensions, shape, and furniture of the cabin of the "Ocean Queen"; but the rainbow is Healy's—typical, of course, of the coming peace. In this picture I seem to be talking, the others attentively listening. Whether Healy made this combination from Admiral Porter's letter or not, I cannot say; but I thought that he caught the idea from what I told him had occurred when saying "that if Lee would only remain in Richmond till I could reach Burkesville we would have him between our thumb and fingers," suiting the action to the word.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It matters little what Healy meant by his historic group, but it is certain that we four sat pretty much as represented, and were engaged in an important conversation during the forenoon of March 28, 1865, and that we parted never to meet again. . . .

With great respect, yours truly,

W. T. SHERMAN, General.

## AN INTERNATIONAL MONEY UNIT.

AFTER the cosmopolitan globe-trotter has muddled his brains by reckoning daily travelling expenses in condors, milreis, pesos, gourdes, doubloons, piastres, sols, kroner, yen, taels, rupees, mahbubs, and florins, he reaches sunny Italy's shores or the isles of Greece with a sigh of relief. He has still to make acquaintance with a new coin, the lira or drachma, as the case may be, but it is the equivalent of the franc and interchangeable with it; and the franc is the monetary unit of Switzerland, France, and Belgium. He can travel from the Mediterranean to the German Ocean without any further worry about money, and when he settles down to studying gulden, dubbeltje and stuivers while crossing the flat marshes that stretch interminably between Antwerp and Rotterdam he wonders why there cannot be a common coin standard for all countries, as well as for five.

Dear to our hearts is our dollar; five times, at least, as dear as the Frenchman's franc; and never would we give it up. Dear to John Bull is his golden "sovereign," as well as his living sovereign of too solid flesh. Any attempt to harmonize the nominal units of the different currencies—to bring pounds, dollars, florins, and francs to a common value—will fail miserably. Fortunately this is not necessary, if the basis of a common monetary unit be made of comparatively small value. The franc, already the unit of five considerable countries, and approximated in value more or less closely by the Spanish peseta, German mark, British shilling, Danish crown, and Yankee quarter, offers, perhaps, the best basis for such an agreement. Let us suppose that an international convention, arbitrarily fixing a certain standard of weight and fineness of metal, both for silver coinage and gold, should agree that all these coins of most common use should conform to that standard, and should be current in all the countries subscribing to the agreement. Our quarter, slightly decreased in value, would then become the American representative of the common coin, and interchangeable with the shilling, franc, crown Danish, and the coinage of the French-Swiss convention. Our dollar would be four units; our half-eagle twenty units, and the equivalent of the sovereign, Napoleon, and twenty-mark piece. The senseless minor British coins, the florin, crown, and half-crown, would bear their present relation to the lighter shilling. The Dutch florin would be two units, the Portuguese milreis four, the ruble two, the Mexican dollar three or possibly four. No nation would need to learn new names or discard familiar ones, which is always a difficult process, as the American fondness for the word "shilling" long after the coin's departure testifies. Minor coinage could well remain as it is. Pence, cents, centimes, and pfennige would trouble no one if all could be referred to a common unit.

The tourists of the earth spend every year from $300,000,000 to $500,000,000 in wandering in strange lands; and at least 1 per cent. goes to the money-changer. Commercial intercourse would be facilitated, as well as the woes of the tourist lightened, by the existence of a coin bearing different names

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in different countries, but always uniform in size, weight, and value, and always receivable for debts at its full worth.

By the adoption of such a common coin we in America would gain something and lose nothing, even in home transactions. Our stay-at-homes, ever in a large, if relatively decreasing, majority, who now are spared the anguish of reckoning in pounds, francs, marks, and florins in a single week, would be relieved of the by no means small inconvenience caused by Canadian coins of precisely equal value with our own, yet which can sometimes be "passed" and sometimes not. It is absurd that a Canadian dollar or quarter should not be as good in New York as in Ottawa, when but a simple agreement is necessary to make it so. Any impairment of the validity of contracts could be avoided, if our gold and silver coins were decreased in size, by legislation providing that all obligations incurred under the old law should be payable according to the old value of the coins. Many of our people have long been clamoring for a "smaller dollar." Here is the proper way to get it. Perhaps their instinct is right in the matter. Ours is about the only country which can stand so large a monetary unit. The shilling is the real unit in English transactions, as the expression "three and six" proves. The nations which enjoy a small unit, like the franc, have many advantages over those with a larger unit like the mark or florin.

The financier, the politician, the gold-bug, the silver-king, would discover objections, some very serious, and obstacles, many very real, to an international measure of value. I am not trying to appropriate the viewpoint of either. But the plain citizen who has listened aghast to the babble of forty discordant mints will agree that it is so desirable that no number of obstacles ought to stand in the way.

JOHN L. HEATON.

## SHALL WE ENDOW OUR AUTHORS?

THE hardships, vexations, and disappointments of the literary calling have often been made known to the public. From the days of the "impransus" Johnson, struggling through fifty years of poverty, down to those of Hood coining jests to keep the wolf from his door, and the late J. G. Wood leaving his family in destitution after a life of unceasing toil, we have heard the same "old, old story" of the unrequited toil of authors; of the daily hand-to-hand and foot-to-foot struggle with adversity for the means of living by men who in other callings might have enjoyed a competence and ease, if not "riches fineless." If, in some respects, the position of the literary man has improved since the days of Grub Street and lordly patronage, yet facts of daily occurrence show, it is said, that the author's millenium is still many ages distant. So far are poets from feeding on nectar and dwelling amid rose-leaves and perfumes, while publishers, hat in hand, kneel by the side of their Sybaritic couches and beseech them for new volumes, that they are lucky if they can keep soul and body together. The fate of not a few authors is prefigured in the experience of one who, on going out of a provision shop where he had done his humble marketing, found that his bacon was wrapped up in a sheet of one of his own productions, and his cheese in a leaf of another. When Hazlitt was asked if he wished his son to follow his own calling, "Oh! God forbid it!" was the quick and impatient reply. "Throw yourself from the steep Tarpeian rock, slap-dash headlong upon iron spikes,' said Charles Lamb, "rather than become the slave of the booksellers!"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

While authorship is often so poorly remunerated, it is, at the same time, the most exhausting of all kinds of mental labor. We are aware that there are a very few writers who think differently—whose views of literary labor are wholly rose-colored. Colonel T. W. Higginson declares, in an essay in the New York *Independent*, that he has never written anything which imposed on him at the time the feeling of drudgery. Few other professional writers—probably not one in a thousand—can boast of such a felicity. Of all the rest, giants or dwarfs, it may be safely asserted that, if there are moments of rapture in their lives which an angel might envy, there are moments, too, of despair which an outcast spirit might beg to be delivered from. It is for this reason that, with rare exceptions, indolence has been the natural habit of imaginative writers in every age. They have almost universally shrunk with instinctive dread from the work of formulating their ideas by thought; much more from that of passing them through the crucible of the ink-bottle—work which is reputed play, but which is, in fact, a battle every moment, between flesh and spirit. Dr. Johnson was, in this respect, a representative of authors in all ages and countries. Though he had abundant resources, and wrote rapidly when he had once broken the ice, yet he himself testifies that composition is usually an effort of slow diligence, to which an author is dragged by necessity, and from which the attention is every moment starting to pleasanter pursuits.

In view of the trials we have enumerated, but especially of the inadequate pecuniary compensation of literary toil, there are authors who, instead of being content that literature, like every other calling, should reap only its natural rewards, would have it endowed. They would have a public fund established for the support of deserving writers who derive an insufficient support from the sale of their works. In a paper on "Authors and Society," read recently before a club in this city, this measure was earnestly advocated. Among the considerations urged in its support is the fact that authors who are capable of far higher things are too often compelled to do hack-work, at once distasteful and inglorious, to support themselves and their families. Only by the severest and most exacting task-work of this kind can they win leisure for the nobler tasks which they love, and in the performance of which they can be most serviceable to society. Again, it is urged that to every nation's literature there must be many worthy contributions which will yield little or no pecuniary profit to author or publisher. There are productions which heavily tax thought, learning, and research, and from which the world derives priceless benefit, but at which no man toils with the hope of getting from their sale even a day-laborer's wages. Who has forgotten the fate of Hume's metaphysical works—works which changed the current of metaphysical thought, but found only here and there a reader, while his superficial history, now half-forgotten, yielded him £5,200 in copyright? Gibbon received, it is true, £6,000 for his great monumental history, the "Decline and Fall," which first bridged the gulf between the old world and the new; yet he toiled at his colossal task in defiance of pecuniary considerations; and the sum he received, he asserts, was only just enough to cover the value of the books which he had to buy for consultation. In our own day, have we not seen Herbert Spencer year after year heroically toiling at his great philosophical works, without the slightest expectation of a support from their sale?

Not only is there no pecuniary profit in those solid scientific and other works which are destined to illumine for a generation or more the minds

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of a few men overtopping their fellow-mortals, and through these few to send a slowly-broadening light down through successive ages of culture, but the same thing is true of many lighter works—works of pure literature, of deliciously overburdened souls speaking to our souls, such as the poems of Wordsworth, Tennyson, and Keats, and the essays of De Quincey, Lamb, Hazlitt, and Hawthorne, which form for many of us so much of the charm of life. We know how long these exquisite productions were neglected by the public—our own shy and sensitive countryman being, as he has told us, for twenty years the most obscure man in America—and that, had their authors depended for a living upon the sale of their works, they must inevitably have starved. Yet such men are driven by the instinct and impulse of genius to toil at their thankless tasks. No divine monition compels a man to keep on making coats or hats, or selling cotton or wheat, if the business does not "pay." But the world wants the "Lyrical Ballads," and "Hyperion," and "The Princess," and Elia's "Essays," and the "Twice-Told Tales"; and the men who can produce such things feel that this is their God-given calling, and that they should be enabled to follow it without anxiety for their bread and butter.

In spite of these arguments, we think that to the scheme in question there are many and fatal objections. One of the chief is the extreme difficulty of distributing the public bounty judiciously and fairly. Supposing a fund established for the support or relief of deserving but neglected authors: who are to be its distributers? and how are they to determine who should be its recipients? In what scales are they to weigh literary productions so as to ascertain their value? By what anthropometer are they to test a writer's genius? Is there anything about which the most acute and intelligent men more widely differ than in their estimates of books and authors? Does not the history of literature abound with proofs that, if Homer sometimes nods, Aristarchus is oftener found napping? that, if works of genius are rare, just judgments of them and their authors are rarer still? Again, is there not reason to fear that in the dispensation of a literary fund personal interest and favoritism will have an influence? Will not the most pushing and self-asserting writers be most likely to receive aid, while the shy and retiring, but more meritorious, ones will be overlooked? It has been a standing complaint against the literary man that he is indolent, impulsive, fitful, and improvident; that he knows better how to earn money than how to spend or save it. He will buy a costly picture, it is said, when his butcher's or baker's bill is unpaid; will give his wife a piano when she needs a dress or a sewing-machine, and buy his children a rocking-horse when they want stockings. Will not these imprudences be aggravated if, whenever he feels the sting of want, he can look to a public fund for support? We believe that the best literary workers will prefer to stand on their own legs rather than on public crutches. Disguise it as we may, there is something humiliating (except in the case of chronic illness) in the thought that one is housed and fed under a literary "poor law." It will be a sad day for literature when it becomes not a profession, but a trade. In the hour when its rewards are dazzling enough and sure enough to tempt men to enter the lists for the sake of the reward, especially the pecuniary one,—to live by their art, instead of for their art,—it will undergo rapid deterioration.

If an author is forced by the necessity of bread to drudge at work of a lower kind than that which he aspires to perform, is his hardship exceptional? Does not the same evil fall to the lot of other professional men?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Do we not all have an inner life of the mind, for which we are forever yearning amid our toils, and in which we would spend all our time, did not the iron necessities of the outer call us in another direction? The curse of the literary profession is that, requiring no special preliminary training and no capital for its pursuit,—only a few quires of paper, a steel pen, and a bottle of ink,—it is recruited by all the vagrant talent of the world, and is consequently overstocked. When there is not enough employment for all, some must starve. An overstocked profession has been compared to a crew trying to save themselves by a raft scarcely large enough to carry half of them; and, again, to the inmates of the Black Hole at Calcutta, where all who could not get near the aperture in the wall were suffocated.

As to those great works which make epochs in a nation's life, and which have to wait long and weary years for appreciators, is not the same hardship the lot of all other professions as well as of literature? Does not the same thing occur in art, in science, in regard to mechanical inventions, and even, many times, in practical enterprises? How can the value of such phenomenal literary works be appreciated in dollars or doubloons? They are inestimable, and the remuneration for writing them, if remuneration be desired, must be sought, like that for the discovery of gravitation or the invention of anæsthetics, in the esteem and gratitude of mankind, and in the consciousness of having conferred an inestimable benefit upon one's fellow-beings.

Finally, we remark that the best literary work in all ages and countries, the weightiest as well as the most brilliant writing, has been done by men who were not what Byron satirizes as "fellows in foolscap uniform, turned up with ink"—that is, authors by profession; a fact which shows that literature has no need of public support. The great writers of Greece and Rome, of Italy and France, of England in the reigns of Elizabeth, the Charleses, Queen Anne, and the Georges, as we could show by hundreds of names that crowd to the point of our pen, were not generally literary men, as we now understand the term, but men of action, trained in business. Such writers have one great advantage over those who write for a living. Not only are their minds at ease, undistracted by any alien anxiety regarding rent, fire, clothing, and food, but the hours thus rescued from their callings, and looked forward to as an escape from money-scales and stocks, from horsehair and bombazine or drugs,—in short, as a change and a recreation,—become inexpressibly delightful; and they, consequently, lose no time in dawdling, but plunge at once into work and make every blow tell. Gifford, the old Quarterly Reviewer, who had had a vivid experience of the pangs and drudgery of writing for a living, once observed—and Coleridge has expressed the sentiment no less strongly—that "a single hour of composition won from the business of the day is worth more than the whole day's toil of him who works at the trade of literature: in the one case the spirit comes joyfully to refresh itself, like a hart to the water-brooks; in the other it pursues its miserable way, panting and jaded, with the dogs and hunger of necessity behind."

WILLIAM MATHEWS.

---

## THE COST OF CONTESTED ELECTIONS.

A MOST valuable commentary upon Speaker Reed's able article in THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for last July, upon the subject of "Contested Elections," is furnished by the recent statement that the cost of the election contests in the House of Representatives of the Fifty-first Congress would

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

probably exceed $100,000. Under the law $2,000 is allowed to each member and contestant to defray the expenses of a contest or of defending the right to a seat; but more and more it is evident that this sum comes far short of covering the legitimate expenses incurred. By special appropriations Congress has often added to the amount allotted by law, until at last it is apparent that the cost of determining whether certain men or certain other men are entitled to occupy seats in the House of Representatives is becoming appalling.

In the article referred to, Mr. Reed pointed out that in the "somewhat celebrated case" of Governor Curtin and Mr. Yocum each party to the contest received $8,000, "and that sum did not pay their expenses within thousands of dollars." That was in the Forty-sixth Congress, during which the sum total paid to contestants and "contestees" was not less than $59,567. In the next Congress a still larger amount was expended for this purpose—$71,285, twenty-four men receiving the sum allowed by law and two members $3,500 apiece. The Speaker proceeded to show that during the last eight Congresses (not counting the present one) $318,000 has been paid for contests in the House, making an average of about $40,000 in each Congress.

The Congress which is about to expire will easily break the record if it turns out that the cost of its election contests exceeds $100,000, as seems likely at the present writing to be the case.

Commenting upon the large figures with which he had been dealing, Speaker Reed said significantly: "Large as is this expenditure, it is not large enough in reality, *if the present system is to be maintained* [the italics are mine]; for the restriction to $2,000 is very hard upon contestants of limited means. If they enter upon a contest, especially in the midst of unfriendly officials, as is the case in some districts, no one can tell where the expense may end. In fact, it may be doubted if the restriction was not suggested and put on with that view, though it is very certain that the Congress which passed the law did not appreciate what it was doing."

The question why the public treasury should bear any of the expenses of election contests which concern only certain individuals naturally arises; and on that point Mr. Reed had a luminous and convincing word to say. "It is precisely because it so much concerns the people to determine who is to rightly represent them that even money becomes of no consequence." "So much, indeed, is the public concerned that it has always been deemed worth while to pay the expenses of both sides so that the truth may be brought out. If, then, we are to pay at all, we must pay all it costs. *And if it costs too much, we ought to devise some plan to lessen the cost.*"

A sounder proposition was never stated in words. That it does cost too much cannot be doubted by any intelligent observer. Not only is the money cost great, but a large share of the time of the House is consumed over election contests. Speaker Reed's contention in the article from which these extracts have been made* was that the proper tribunals for the disposition of election contests are the courts of the United States. The argument in favor of that policy is quite unanswerable. Great Britain adopted it more than twenty years ago, and there has never been a serious suggestion that a return to the old system would be advisable. The case was strongly put in a special message sent to the New York Legislature nearly a year ago by

* NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, vol. 151, pp. 115, 116.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Governor Hill. There was some partisian denunciation of Mr. Hill for his "new departure," but no answer was offered to his main proposition that contested-election cases should go before the courts for adjudication and settlement. The subject is now before the New York Legislature in the form of a concurrent resolution proposing an amendment to the constitution whereby "the Legislature may provide by law for judicial proceedings in the courts of the State to determine questions relating to contested seats in either house, and that judgment in such a proceeding shall be conclusive as to the election and qualifications of the person in whose favor it is rendered."

Under the present method it is almost inevitable that contested cases are decided more from partisan considerations than strictly according to the evidence. It is true that one of the contests in the present House of Representatives was decided in favor of the Democrat who held the seat that was contested; but a single case does not prove that the Committee on Elections was a non-partisan body. Where one party has only a narrow majority, it is only human nature for it to attempt to increase that majority if a reasonable pretext for doing so can be found in contested elections. Public confidence in the fairness and impartiality of our courts has never been shaken, and no one can doubt that in their hands contested-election cases would be decided with substantial justice, and with as little reference as possible to partisan concerns.

However, my main point is the necessity of putting an end to the heavy bills of expenses which are piling themselves up in connection with cases of this character. If the total has reached $100,000 now, who knows that it may not soon reach $200,000? "*If it costs too much, we ought to devise some plan to lessen the cost.*" It does cost too much, and the machinery for lessening the cost is ready to hand. The subject is one that demands early and the most serious consideration from Congress. Speaker Reed will be in the minority after March 4. He can scarcely do his country a greater service than by agitating this question and bringing about, if possible, a reform in the present costly, cumbrous, unsatisfactory, and partisan method of dealing with election contests in the House of Representatives.

JULIAN PROCTOR.

## IS OUR NATION DEFENCELESS?

IF THE people of the United States were to be divided according to their ideas concerning public defence, they might be generally grouped into four classes, thus: (1) those who never think about it; (2) those who dismiss it with a notion that the country never need have another war; (3) those who think that the United States can fight the world at a day's notice; (4) those who see how utterly unprepared we are. Three of these classes are living in a fool's paradise, in spite of the repeated warnings of soldiers, who, while they are in no sense alarmists, are still alarmed at the apathy and hostility with which their prudent counsels have been treated. A glimmer of the truth regarding the navy seems growing to a light, and, although the Pacific coast is entirely neglected, a few inadequate appropriations have been made for the defence of a small part of the Atlantic seaboard, and provision has been made for a few modern guns.

But the land forces, the men who should always be in training, the army and militia, are practically neglected. The army is wretchedly small; the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

militia has had no general law enacted for it since 1792, and is dependent upon such legislation as the several States may see fit to enact.

Peace has prevailed for more than twenty-five years. The veterans of the last war are passing away. Many of their sons have gone beyond the age when a man is most fit for soldiering. The generation which would be called upon to fight if war came now is entirely untrained. The country does not possess a modern book of tactics. Yet it is not unusual to hear men who ought to know better declare that "the United States, if pushed to extremity, would spring to arms and create an army almost in a day, as it did in 1861." This is nonsense, the result of bravado and ignorance. Neither this nation nor any other ever created on the spur of the moment an army or navy worthy of the name. At the close of the War of the Rebellion the armies of both the North and South were as good for their time as the world ever saw, and, in some respects, looking to the material of which they were chiefly composed, they were superior to any armies that had ever existed; but they had become so only after long training and hard fighting. At first they were little better than armed mobs, each as bad as its adversary. They grew together, fighting each other stubbornly, yet often indecisively, because, as the training of one side advanced, so did that of the other, until at the close of the conflict they were really formidable. They deserved to the full the measure of praise awarded to them by one of England's most distinguished military writers, Colonel Charles Chesney, who, after Europe had witnessed the Franco-German War, penned these words:

> "There is a disposition to regard the American generals and the troops they led as altogether inferior to regular soldiers. This prejudice was born out of the blunders and want of coherence exhibited by undisciplined volunteers at the outset—faults amply atoned for by the stubborn courage displayed on both sides throughout the rest of the struggle; while, if a man's claims to be regarded as a veteran are to be measured by the amount of actual fighting he has gone through, the most seasoned soldiers of Europe are but as conscripts compared with the survivors of that conflict."

If a text were wanted for a sermon on the vanity of buncombe, it might well be taken in Colonel Chesney's phrase, "the blunders and want of coherence exhibited by undisciplined volunteers at the outset." His words denote the danger that will inevitably threaten the United States if a war should come under anything like the present condition of affairs.

Our army has but a nominal strength of 25,000 men. It is scattered over a vast territory in small detachments, and were it to be concentrated,—a task requiring time,— its parts would be for a still longer time strange to each other and consequently incoherent. It would then be better, of course, than hastily-organized volunteers, but it would be for a period inferior to troops that had been accustomed to manœuvre in large bodies.

The militia in the several States varies greatly. Some States, so far as the infantry arm is concerned, have what may fairly be called compact little armies, but these are the exception rather than the rule; and even in the States thus prepared the instruction of their forces is quite elementary, outside of a fair knowledge of camp duty under the most favorable peace conditions, where the men live almost as well as though quartered in first-class hotels.

In case of war, the President may call out the militia for a limited time—too limited to make the call an effective element of active operations. Hence the law of the land provides for the organization of volunteers, who may be called into service for a term of three years if necessary, and it is upon these volunteers that the chief dependence of the country must rest. They cannot

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be called out until the last moment, and they must be trained before they can be of any use. The problem, therefore, which ought to attract attention is, how to provide the means for making these volunteers into effective troops in the shortest possible time.

As the academy at West Point is the school for officers of the army, so the army and militia are the schools for officers of the volunteers. Thus the army and militia have each a two-fold function—*i. e.*, each is a force, and each is a school for the elements of additional force. Each should be maintained with both these functions constantly in view.

The army not only is too small, but, under the present system of recruiting it in the large cities, it is composed of a lower order of men than it should be obliged to accept. If it could be enlarged to twice its present size, say to 50,000 men, quartered in and recruited from the States of the Union upon some such basis as the apportionment of congressional representation, so that the regiments would become identified to a certain extent with the locality of their stations, there can be no doubt that the character of its members would be raised in proportion to its increase in strength.

One reason why the people take so little interest in the army is because they rarely see any portion of it worthy of notice; but whole regiments, or at least respectable detachments, with men locally recruited, near their homes, contented, and therefore less liable to desertion than they are now, would not only attract attention so as to arouse their pride as soldiers, but would excite an interest politically in their very existence, while as examples to the militia they would exert a most beneficial influence.

Such a plan would help the militia as much as it would help the army. Each needs the help of the other. The army needs the political interest of the militia to make Congress enact a law to increase the army and locate it among the States, while the militia needs the help of the army in harmonizing the present military statutes of the States into a national militia law. Any attempt at making such a law by conventions of militia officers, or through the political representatives of the States, will result as heretofore—in nothing; but after the army has been quartered among the States, upon the plan herein indicated, for a period long enough for careful observation and comparison,—say three years,—a convention of army officers could easily prepare a scheme for a proper statute.

Thus the interests of army and militia are identical; and this community of interest ought to result in the training of a citizen soldier better prepared than his predecessor of 1861 to organize the regiments of volunteers upon whom, in case war comes, the country must rely.

General Schofield, now commanding the army, modestly suggested in his report for 1890 that it be increased to 30,000 men. Such a force is too small for the present needs of the country, notwithstanding the buncombe of newspapers about the dread of standing armies and the power of short-term militia men in war, as instanced in the following extract from an editorial in one of the leading daily papers of the country, commenting upon General Schofield's report:

"While it is, perhaps, to be expected that the improvements in army regulations and discipline brought about in the past year may improve the general average of enlisted men and give the country a more efficient standing army than it has had hitherto, it is not to be hoped that the service will be brought to such a strength as will completely satisfy General Schofield. The whole feeling of the citizens and voters of the United States is far more strongly against a large standing army than most army officers are apt to realize, and it must be confessed that there is much in the history of the past to strengthen and confirm that feeling.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"At all events, the United States already has in its national guard a body of men of whom it may well feel proud, and who will in part, if not wholly, take the place of a standing army in any time of emergency. The national guards of this and many other States are organizations on which the country can depend for its defence from invasion. At each annual encampment the high general tone and splendid character of the troops become more and more marked, until they are, in some respects, ahead of the army itself. Certainly they are not one whit behind it in courage or loyalty."

It is difficult for any one acquainted with the defenceless condition of the country to read patiently vaporings like this, and it is discouraging to think that any part of the people, however small, may be thereby led to consider a wretchedly small force of 30,000 men too large a standing army for this great nation, or to harbor a delusion that our militia can successfully withstand trained regular soldiers; but the editorial just quoted pales before another, published a few weeks earlier in a newspaper whose circulation is one of the largest in the Union. It is so remarkable that it is worth quoting entire. It is headed "A Waste of Money," and is as follows:

"While it is interesting to learn that the government has taken the first steps toward spending $7,500,000 upon the defences of Boston Harbor, and has also outlined plans for similar and perhaps larger expenditures at other seaports, it may be pertinent to ask if these outlays are in any way in accordance either with common-sense or with the professed peaceful policy of our government. If the citizens of Boston were given by the national government $7,500,000 to be devoted to works of public utility and amusement, the benefit that could thus be permanently secured would be incalculably great. This sum might be invested so as to bring in an annual income of from $250,000 to $300,000 a year, and if this income were spent in free excursions to school-children and others, great entertainments in our public squares, or in giving premiums for the erection and maintenance of model tenement-houses, or a part of it in carrying on certain scientific investigations for the benefit of the people, an immense amount of service could be done. As it is, this money is to be spent from time to time in the erection of what are now to a large degree, and will in the future be still more, needless works of military defence. We are now a people of nearly 65,000,000, and at the close of the present century will have more than 80,000,000 of inhabitants. Our wealth for all practical purposes is unlimited. There is no nation that can invade us, and, thanks to the international policy that we have pursued from the first, we have no reason to quarrel with foreign countries. For the last quarter of a century our harbors have been defenceless, with the chances of attack far greater than they will be in the future. More than this, if a foreign attack was to be expected, the teachings of modern science in the use of high explosives and electricity would, in all probability, long before the time of danger came, enable us to provide ourselves with defences that no enemy would dare to encounter. The expenditure, therefore, except as a means of relieving the treasury of money, and in this way of spending the surplus, is almost entirely uncalled for. It is a pity that where so much good money is going to waste some really good deserving public use cannot be made of it."

It it high time for delusions and misrepresentations and arrant nonsense like these articles to cease. The people are not all fools, nor can the bulk of them be in sympathy with utterances so manifestly against reason and experience. War does not wait for the planting of foundries, yards, factories, and arsenals, and the making of ships, guns, armor, explosives, and scientific appliances, nor for the training of armies. Hostilities once declared, the unprepared weakling must go to the wall. Judicious appropriations for the public defence are the premiums for the life insurance of a nation. War ransoms are no part of true political economy. Let us give "millions for defence, but not one cent for tribute."

THOMAS F. EDMANDS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED